

coln and the conclusion of the Civil War, Rev. Edgar H. Gray prayed: "Glory be to Thy name, O God, that the Republic still lives, the Nation survives, the country is safe. Glory be to Thy name that our heroic efforts have been crowned with victory, so that the desolations of war have ceased, and the ground no longer shakes beneath the tread of armies. We praise Thee with thanksgiving that the statue of Freedom now looks down from our Capitol upon an entire Nation of freemen."

At the first meeting of the House on June 28, 1919, after the signing of the Versailles Treaty, Dr. Henry N. Couden's prayer went like this: "We thank Thee that a peace treaty has been signed by a majority of the leading nations; and while it may not be adequate to the needs of the world we most fervently pray that it may be a steppingstone to a higher civilization from which shall spring spontaneously from the hearts of all men and of all nations a peace pact which shall spare the word from a holocaust through which it has just passed, leaving it inexpressibly sad and mournful in the loss of men and means."

One of the most beautiful of Dr. Braskamp's prayers was the one he gave after V-E Day, May 8, 1945, when he was substituting for Dr. Montgomery: "O Lord God Omnipotent, who maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth, we praise and magnify Thy holy name, for through Thy might and Thy mercy we have been brought to this day of grace and victory. When we call to memory with pride, gratitude, and love that vast multitude who struggled so heroically and endured so valiantly, giving their very lifeblood in order that this day might be possible, we cry out, 'Alas, alas, next to defeat, the saddest thing is victory at such a cost.' We pray that we may earnestly and faithfully endeavor to prove worthy of their sufferings and sacrifice."

On the day of the conference at San Francisco to establish the United Nations, April 25, 1945, 20 years ago, Dr. Braskamp prayed in part: "Today we are joining struggling and war-torn humanity in its prayers for Thy special blessing upon those chosen representatives who are now seeking to organize the good will of the nations of the earth for a lasting peace."

The day after President Truman ordered General MacArthur to support the Republic of South Korea, June 28, 1950, Dr. Braskamp prayed in part: "Grant that in these days of strife an confusion, of storm and tumult, we may carry on in the glad assurance that the Lord of Hosts is with us, and the God of righteousness is our refuge and strength."

When President Kennedy was killed, the Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, prayed in part: "God of the living and of the living dead: as in this hour we bow in the shadow of a people's grief, Thou dost hear the sobbing of a stricken nation. But we come with the comfort that Thou knowest what is in the darkness, and that the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee."

These historical facts and quotations which I have brought to you this morning are illustrative of a very important but little publicized institution in government. The total effect of these prayers through the generations cannot be measured. It is certain, however, that they are symbolic of the deep purpose of the men who have been responsible for the direction of our government since its inception. They demonstrate clearly that we as a people have always tied and still do tie the destiny of this Republic to the spiritual ideals of our people.

There is no chaplain in the Comintern—but this is a nation under God.

## Governor Scranton's \$10 Billion 10-Year Pennsylvania Highway Program

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a State's highways are truly its lifelines—for commerce, communication, and personal mobility.

Gov. William Scranton's bold new \$10 billion 10-year highway improvement program is a giant step forward to place Pennsylvania first in highways in the Nation. Announced February 1, 1965, the program has begun projects in 50 counties under the able direction of State Highway Secretary Henry D. Harral. A new computerized system for tracking all highway projects has been instituted to assure competent, efficient administration of this forward-looking program.

To show the progress being made in Pennsylvania, I insert for the RECORD the following letter and news clippings.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,

Harrisburg, June 30, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAMES FULTON: The department of highways is dedicated to serving all Pennsylvanians by making technically possible Governor Scranton's \$10 billion, 10-year highway revolution.

As early evidence that this bold program is on the move, we thought you would be interested in these recent news clippings.

Sincerely,

HENRY D. HARRAL,  
Secretary of Highways.

PENNSYLVANIA STORY—HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT PROVING IT CAN HANDLE \$10 BILLION LOAD  
(By Mason Denison)

HARRISBURG.—The State department of highways apparently means business in its efforts to prove it can handle the \$10 billion highway program proposed by Governor Scranton.

Within the last month the department has: (1) made four major appointments; (2) submitted a record \$292 million construction budget; (3) established the highest mark ever for advertising projects for construction.

And, when the columns are counted for the fiscal year that ends June 30, the highest value of projects advertised for construction in 1 year are indicated for the books.

Listing the accomplishments, State highways secretary, Henry D. Harral, was quick to point out that the marks were established by any organization using many outmoded administrative practices which since have been changed.

"All I can see are great days ahead," he told this column when asked to outline what was going on within the department since February 1, when the Governor proposed his \$10 billion plan.

He admitted being somewhat "conservative" in his approach to the Governor's plan at first but now is one of its most enthusiastic supporters. Since directing many administrative changes within the framework of the department, Mr. Harral has seen a rapid increase in the output potential of the department.

"The Governor's plan has attracted wide attention in the engineering field," the secretary said. He explained, for example, that the announcement has stimulated recruiting of professional people. In fact engineers from 47 States have filed applications for employment in the department.

Within a week, when the fiscal year ends, Mr. Harral said a record high of nearly \$276 million in construction plans will have been advertised during fiscal 1964-65. This is \$58 million above the \$219 million for fiscal 1963-64.

He attributed the sizable production increase to a new plans review procedure that saved time in putting projects under construction. Put into effect right after the Governor presented his (\$10 billion) message, the new procedure was responsible for starting projects in 50 counties that represented more than 300 miles of improvements.

Four recent appointments in high administrative posts in the department are credited by the highways chief with helping to accelerate production upward. (The appointments are Victor W. Anckaitis of Easton, chief engineer; Robert C. Rosser of Mt. Joy and David C. Sims of Camp Hill, deputy chief engineers; and Robert G. Bartlett, Bethlehem, special assistant for administration.)

A new computerized system for tracking all highway projects has been initiated to "eliminate human fallouts" and maintain construction schedules. The department has nearly \$2 billion of plans on the drawing board. These plans will build 4,500 miles of highways. Each plan now will be watched closely by the computers.

Interestingly, Mr. Harral feels that without the computerized system the \$10 billion program "wouldn't get off the ground." (This also will play an important role in the State's first long-range construction program to be announced before July 1 by the State highway commission.)

"We recognized early that it was necessary to change many of our operational efforts and to look at the department as the one-half billion dollars a year business it is," Mr. Harral said.

The department's total budget this year is \$593 million—of which \$292 million is for construction, \$67 million will be for acquiring rights-of-way and \$45 million will be used for major maintenance improvements.

To maintain an accelerated pace the highways department during 1965-66 expects to advertise \$340 million in construction plans in comparison with the \$275 million production record established in fiscal 1964-65.

### TIME-SAVING PROGRAM INITIATED TO SPEED HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

A time-saving innovation to speed highway construction will get its baptism of fire this year in Pennsylvania, Highway Secretary Henry D. Harral said today.

The State highway department will establish mobile testing laboratories in three areas to bring quality control standards closer to the job. Tests previously were monitored at the department's laboratory in Harrisburg.

### FIELD LABORATORIES

The location of the field laboratories in Scranton, Franklin, and Indiana will eventually eliminate the practice of sending materials and samples to Harrisburg for testing. Harral said this procedure is not adequate in meeting today's accelerated highway construction program.

The first mobile lab should be in operation by June. It will serve the Scranton district with headquarters at Dunmore. Materials will be tested for Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, Bradford, Susquehanna, Pike, and Wyoming Counties.

At the Franklin district, a steel fabricated laboratory building is scheduled to be in operation early this summer. It will handle general field tests of materials. As much as a week will be saved since only random and quality tests will continue to be run at Harrisburg. Laboratory technicians and engineers will augment the Franklin staff to perform these essential services. The Franklin district includes Erie, Crawford, Mercer, Lawrence, Venango, Forest, and Warren Counties.

Harral said the branch laboratory at Indiana will be operating by midsummer. Tests will be run for the Indiana, Clearfield, Hollidaysburg, Pittsburgh, and Uniontown districts.

Plans are currently nearing completion for an estimated \$250,000 renovation program to convert the old Indiana County maintenance building, 4th and Chestnut Streets, into the testing laboratory.

At the start of operations, material testing will be limited to aggregates, sand and anti-skid materials but, eventually, the plan calls for virtually all types of testing at the facility.

In most instances, it is hoped to have tests completed and returned to the job site within 24 hours. The technical staff is expected to be increased.

When the first three facilities are operative, the department plans to establish field and branch labs to serve the remaining districts, Harral said.

The highway secretary said the \$10-billion 10-year highway improvement program proposed by Governor Scranton to place Pennsylvania first in highways in the Nation, will be accelerated by the branch and field labs program, supervised by Cyril D. Jensen, head of the materials testing and research bureau.

*Fe On Hansen*  
U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GEORGE HANSEN**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1965, the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, speaking to the annual convention of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in Albuquerque, N. Mex., gave an extremely thought-provoking address on U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Very simply, very clearly, and very forcefully, Mr. MacArthur refutes the arguments of those who say we should unconditionally withdraw from Vietnam—or who would have us believe that negotiation is a miracle drug that will, in itself, automatically restore peace and brotherhood to the world.

As a statement of the policy of the United States in regards to Vietnam, I am sure these words of strength, assurance, and determination will be hailed by free peoples everywhere.

The address follows:

#### U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Address by the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, to the annual convention of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Albuquerque, N. Mex., May 17, 1965)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to appear before this distinguished group this

evening. My pleasure comes partly from my recollection of a very inspiring discussion which I had with your president, Mrs. Moorhead, and a group of members of the National Congress of Parent-Teachers' Associations in Brussels in the summer of 1964.

But more fundamentally, I am happy to have this opportunity because I want to thank you for something you have done, and to encourage you to continue to do it. I refer to the efforts you have been engaged in to make America's schools better than they already are—ever more equal to the ever more challenging task of preparing American men and women for the work that their country and the world will increasingly demand of them.

The Department of State is deeply interested in the efforts being made to teach social studies, history, and the other disciplines needed for an understanding of the world situation. Our interest is not unselfish. Why? Because whether we like it or not our country has had a mantle of free world leadership thrust upon it in a changing world. And with change comes new and difficult problems in every corner of the earth demanding new insight, understanding, and imagination.

Thomas Jefferson, our first Secretary of State, once said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." And so today as the world grows more complex, as foreign relations becomes more and more intertwined with the daily lives of all Americans, so it becomes more and more important that our schools help equip our young people to understand and cope with those problems.

To meet this tremendous challenge in the years that lie ahead, our Foreign Service must seek young men and women—your sons and daughters—who are equipped to meet that challenge. We need the best, the finest of young America.

Therefore we hope that the youth of our country, now in the public schools and the high schools of the Nation, will be given the kind of educational background which will both encourage them to think of the Foreign Service as a career and enable them to qualify for it. Thus they can play an active part in the great struggle for a better world in which there will be peace with freedom and justice for all peoples.

And when we speak of the struggle for peace with freedom and justice, one part of the world—southeast Asia—immediately comes to mind. There, a struggle—a crisis is occurring that may appear very complex but which at the same time is simpler in its essential meaning for the American people than any other of the troubles in which this troubled time abounds.

The central crisis on the American agenda today is the struggle in Vietnam. On no other front are American vital interests so deeply and directly involved. In no other part of the world today is there such immediate peril to the security of free peoples and to the cause of peace with freedom and justice for which the United States stands.

The history of Vietnam and the struggle there is a complicated one. But the issue is simple. Bluntly stated, the question is, "Can aggression be made profitable?"

Let there be no mistake on this point. What is happening in Vietnam is not a civil war. It is not an insurrection. It is not a popular uprising, nor is it, in the terms Hanoi and Peiping prefer to use, "a war of national liberation." It is aggression, pure and simple.

I was in France in 1939 when hundreds of thousands of German troops, armed to the teeth with all the latest devices of warfare, went boiling across the borders of Poland on their way to conquest. I was in France in 1940 when hundreds of thousands more German troops smashed into neutral Holland and Belgium and then into France. I remember debates as to what America's reac-

tion should be—but I cannot remember any debates as to whether or not Nazi Germany was committing aggression against its neighbors.

In 1950, North Korean soldiers in great numbers rolled across the 38th parallel where for three bloody years men from Korea, the United States and other free nations resisted their aggression so that a small nation that was minding only its own business could remain free. I can recall that there were differences over how to cope with that aggression. But I do not remember any respected segment of opinion which denied that aggression had indeed taken place.

Aggression does not lose its character because efforts are made to conceal its naked character or because the time schedule is drawn out—or because trained men and weapons of war are introduced by stealth across frontiers and then unleashed in a savage assault on free peoples—or because the aggressor's troops speak the same language as their victims.

This is what has been happening and is happening today in Vietnam.

We are, in short, confronted with aggression by the Communist regime in Hanoi, spurred on by Peiping, against the Government and people of South Vietnam. The United States is helping the South Vietnamese at their request, in their interest; in our own clear, unmistakable national interest and in the interest of the free peoples of southeast Asia and elsewhere as many of them have made clear to us.

This proposition has been challenged in some quarters on several counts. The challenge deserves analysis and response.

First, we are told that the requests for help came from an earlier South Vietnamese Government. Originally, they did. But in spite of changes in Saigon, every succeeding Government has renewed the original request for help in its struggle to remain free. Today the present Government there remains as firmly committed to the struggle against Hanoi's aggression as any of its predecessors have been. And the people of South Vietnam, when they are not terrorized into passiveness by the Vietcong—by murder, kidnappings and other savagery—demonstrate persistent support of their Government.

We sometimes hear that cases of South Vietnamese collaboration with the Vietcong are an indication that the South Vietnamese do not have their hearts in the war. Let me again draw on my own experience.

I was in France for over half of the Nazi occupation. Many Frenchmen obeyed the orders of their armed and ruthless Nazi conquerors. They felt they had no other choice if their families were to survive. A few—a very few—actively collaborated. The collaborators were never mistaken by the outside world as being the true spokesmen of France—and those who complied with Nazi demands backed by threats to lives of their families reacted, I think, as most of us would react in the same circumstances. Today in certain areas in South Vietnam we have a similar situation.

There is another aspect of the picture I would like to mention. The North Vietnamese have repeatedly referred to their attack upon South Vietnam as a "war of national liberation." Some have implied that Hanoi and Peiping are reacting only to our presence in South Vietnam—that the Vietcong represent an armed popular rebellion in South Vietnam against an unpopular government and army.

Let's look at the statistics. In January of 1964 there were 223 Vietcong military attacks. But in that same month, these so-called "liberators" carried out 1,244 acts of terror against innocent civilians, killing 148 civilians, wounding 160, and kidnapping 787 others. In December 1964—12 months later—the number of armed attacks against South Vietnam Government forces dwindled to 96, while the number of acts of terror had grown to 1,719. In that month, 112

civilians were killed, 161 seriously wounded, and 598 kidnapped. And all this, violence directed by the Communist regime in Hanoi against innocent and peaceful civilians, was carried on in the name of a "war of national liberation." This is, I suggest, not a people in arms rising against an unpopular government. This is simple thuggery, directed from North Vietnam against the people of South Vietnam, in an effort to impose upon them the Communist system of the north.

The State Department white paper of February shows conclusively what the SEATO Council meeting in London stated less than 2 weeks ago that the struggle in Vietnam is "an aggression organized, directed, applied and supported by the Communist regime in North Vietnam, in contravention of the basic obligations of international law and in flagrant violation of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962."

Nor is this a new conclusion, announced now to a hitherto unsuspecting world. A year ago, at the conclusion of the ninth SEATO Council meeting, the members of that organization found that the Vietcong attacks were "an organized campaign, directed, supplied and supported by the Communist regime in North Vietnam."

And 3 years ago—in 1962—the International Control Commission, consisting of India, Poland, and Canada, reached a similar conclusion in a majority report. A year before that—in 1961—the State Department publication, "A Threat to Peace," set forth voluminous evidence that this same campaign of aggression was going on.

I have heard some people say, "Even if this is aggression, we should end it by negotiation, not by war. Why isn't the United States willing to negotiate?"

The answer to that is very simple. We are willing to negotiate and we have been willing to negotiate for over 10 years.

In 1954 the United States and eight other nations, including the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the North Vietnamese, were together at the conference table in Geneva where agreements were hammered out to protect the freedom and independence of the South Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian peoples.

We agreed to respect that agreement.

The Hanoi regime was also committed to respect it. However the ink was hardly dry before Hanoi began to violate it by ordering its agents to go underground, caching arms in South Vietnam and organizing secret bases for future aggression.

Again in 1962, the United States sat down at the conference table with 13 other countries in our effort to preserve the independence of Laos. Again, the Soviet Union, the Chinese Communists, the North Vietnamese were present with representatives of Laos, South Vietnam, and other countries immediately involved. Again agreements were hammered out that if observed would have brought peace to Laos and preserved its freedom. Once again, the ink on the agreement was not dry when Hanoi proceeded to violate the prohibitions on the presence of foreign forces and then directed the Communist Pathet Lao to resume their savage assault on the forces of the peaceful little Kingdom of Laos.

And more recently, with what I believe must be considered commendable patience, we have invited Hanoi to enter into unconditional discussions, only to have that offer, up until this time, rebuffed.

But even if the other side proves willing to negotiate—and we hope it will—I would emphasize that negotiations and peace are not the same thing, as our experience in 1954 and 1962 makes quite clear. Negotiations are not an end unto themselves. For us they are a means to reach an honorable settlement that will respect the freedom and independence of a small country—the Republic of Vietnam—that asks only to be left alone.

For the other side negotiations in the past have meant something different. They have served as a smokescreen behind which stealthily and concealed aggression has continued. Let me emphasize that the United States insists upon an honorable settlement for the Republic of Vietnam that will preserve its independence. We will not resort to negotiations as a cloak for capitulation.

I have heard it said the so-called loss of face we might suffer in simply withdrawing from Vietnam "is not worth the death of one American." I agree. "Face" is not worth the death of one American or one Vietnamese or one old blind mule. But we are not talking about saving "face." We are talking about the fate of the people of South Vietnam—and what is even more important—about the people of every nation in the free world.

Indeed it is the Hanoi regime itself that makes this clear. General Giap, commander of the North Vietnamese Communist Army, has stated publicly "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world." Let me repeat—"everywhere in the world."

In the 1930's, when I was a young Foreign Service officer in Europe, young men with swastikas on their arms were marching through the streets of Germany, singing the anthem of the Nazi movement, the Horst Wessel song. "Today Germany is ours. Tomorrow the entire world." Some Americans thought this was a joke. Others thought that it was purely an internal German affair. Others thought the Nazi appetites could be satisfied by negotiation. We heard every argument against stopping the Nazis that we have heard in favor of withdrawing from Vietnam.

And what happened? We listened when the Nazi jackboots marched into the Rhineland. We listened when the Horst Wessel song was sung in Vienna following the rape of Austria. We listened when the Sudetenland was torn from Czechoslovakia and when what was left of that once free country became a reichsprotectorat. We listened later when Poland was savagely smashed, when neutral Holland and Belgium were crushed, and devoured and France overrun. And we were to listen later to the burning of London, the ravishing of Yugoslavia, the sound of panzers in Athens, and stukas over the Soviet Union. And we were to listen later to the smashing of bombs and the crackle of flames as Pearl Harbor went up in smoke and gallant Americans died in a sea of flames.

But there was a voice in the 1930's that many did not listen to. Many did not listen, after Munich, to a Member of the British House of Commons who told his country and the world:

"Do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless, by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigor, we arise again and take our stand by freedom as in the olden time."

Eventually, of course, we and other free peoples listened to Winston Churchill. We listened almost too late, but not quite. And we prevailed.

But at what a tragic cost.

Today we have been given fair warning of Hanoi's and Peiping's intentions. If we withdraw, if we do not stick by the Republic of Vietnam whose only desire is to remain free and who asks our help we will encourage the belief that aggression pays off and can succeed if disguised as a war of national liberation.

And if we show that we are not prepared to stand by our commitments to South Vietnam, no one else is likely to believe that our

commitments anywhere else can be depended on.

In 1939, Germany finally went to war—her appetite having grown by what it fed upon since 1936. Every historian of the crucial days just prior to the invasion of Poland agrees that the German Government went to war secure in the assumption—solidly based on the history of the preceding 3 years—that Britain and France would not abide by their commitments. These commitments existed, and they had been made as specific and as pointed as words could make them. They lacked only one crucial ingredient—credibility.

From the lessons of the 1930's we have learned, I believe, that freedom is indivisible—that as the area of freedom shrinks from aggression our own security and our own freedom are threatened. We cannot, we must not repeat the tragic error of the 1930's. We cannot afford to encourage further aggression and eventually invite another kind of Pearl Harbor.

So let us renew our commitment to the defense of freedom in the world today. Let us show that this commitment is credible. But at the same time let us continue to make clear that we are prepared to discuss without conditions an honorable settlement that asks nothing for the United States and seeks only the continued freedom and independence for the people of the Republic of Vietnam.

## The Proposed 25th Amendment to the Constitution on Presidential Disability and Succession

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge prompt ratification by the legislatures of the several States of the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

This proposed amendment, overwhelmingly adopted by both House and Senate, can be of vital importance in helping clear up some 175 years of constitutional uncertainty and in assuring the continuity of the legal Government of the United States whenever the questions of Presidential disability or succession arise, or a vacancy in the office of the Vice President occurs.

As cosponsor of the joint congressional resolution which proposed the amendment, I believe we have come to realize more fully than ever before, especially since the tragic assassination of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, that we can no longer afford, in this nuclear space age, to gamble with the future stability of our Government by leaving its fate to the uncertain whims of chance.

Nothing less than the safe and sure continuity of the legal Government of the United States is at stake. This essential continuity has been endangered many times in the past, and in some instances, only good fortune has prevented possible disaster.

For more than a year after Lyndon Johnson became President, our national luck held out, and we were all witnesses to an impressive demonstration of the true inner strength of America's democratic traditions.

The new President firmly and quickly took up the reins of leadership, to assure continuity of the Government in the midst of a great constitutional crisis, to begin to heal the Nation's wounds, and to reestablish in our people a sense of unity and brotherhood and faith in the future.

This experience has again focused public attention on the critical issue of Presidential and Vice Presidential succession, as well as the related, and in some ways more difficult, problem of Presidential disability.

As a result, there has developed a strong national consensus in favor of resolving these issues in a positive way, so that there will be no doubt concerning the constitutional provisions for handling such problems in the future.

As an affirmative response to the need for a solution to these problems, the joint congressional resolution proposes to amend the Constitution in three respects: first, it confirms the established custom that a Vice President, succeeding to a vacancy in the office of the President, becomes President in his own right instead of merely Acting President; second, it establishes a procedure for filling a vacancy in the office of Vice President; and third, it deals with the problem of Presidential disability.

Section 1 of the proposed amendment provides that in the case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

Section 2 provides that in the event of a Vice-Presidential vacancy, the President can nominate a new Vice President, who will take office when he has been confirmed by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

Section 3 enables a President to declare his own disability to exercise the powers and duties of his office, thus voluntarily turning over those powers and duties, but not the office, to the Vice President who then becomes Acting President, until such time as the President declares that the disability no longer exists, and he resumes the powers and duties of his office.

In the absence of a Presidential declaration of disability, section 4 permits the Vice President, with the approval of a majority of the Cabinet, or such other body as Congress may stipulate, to make such a declaration, and to assume the presidential responsibilities as Acting President. It also provides for quick and orderly congressional resolution of any dispute over the President's ability, by authorizing him to resume discharging the powers and duties of his office unless two-thirds of both House and Senate agree with the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet—or such other body as Congress has stipulated—that the President is unable to perform those duties.

This proposed amendment, though not perfect, represents a sincere effort on the

part of many persons who have studied the admittedly complicated issues involved to offer a workable means of solving difficult and delicate problems affecting the continuity and perhaps even the life of our Government.

A variety of suggestions have been made to improve this proposed amendment, and Congress has given full and thorough consideration to all these suggestions, and, in fact, has incorporated several of them into the joint resolution.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our State legislatures to act without unnecessary delay, for the subject is important to the future stability and peace of this Nation, and we cannot afford the risk that further delay would entail in this vital matter.

As President Johnson stated in his message to Congress:

Favorable action \* \* \* will, I believe, assure the orderly continuity in the Presidency that is imperative to the success and stability of our system.

Action \* \* \* now will allay future anxiety among our people—and among the peoples of the world—in the event senseless tragedy or unforeseeable disability should strike again at either or both of the principal offices of our constitutional system.

If we act now, without undue delay, we shall have moved closer to achieving perfection of the great constitutional document on which the strength and success of our system have rested for nearly two centuries.

### Notes United Arab Republic Publication of Book on the Nile by Jew

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to a very wonderful book on the Nile River, "Nile: Lifeline of Egypt", Scarsdale, N.Y.; Garrard, 1965, written by a well-known American author, Mrs. Violet Weingarten.

No greater tribute could be given this work than that paid by the Egyptian Government which has purchased the rights for its publication in the United Arab Republic in Arabic. I believe that this is the first instance in modern history of United Arab Republic purchase for publication of a book written by a Jewish author. Perhaps it is a presage of better relations to come between the Arab world and the Jews. I hope so. At the least, it is a deserving honor to a fine author and her very worthy book, "Nile: Lifeline of Egypt."

#### CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

#### PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

#### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

#### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

#### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

#### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.



Railway fought the Interstate Commerce Commission for 2 years to be permitted to lower the freight rates made possible by "Big John." After another 2 years' operation, Southern is reporting on the effect of the Big John savings to the grain user. Here is the score. In the Southeastern States in the past 2 years 23 new feed mills have been built and 41 existing feed mills have been expanded. In these 2 years 35 new cattle feed lots have been opened and 17 existing cattle feed lots have been expanded, 16 new hog feed lots have been built, and 3 existing hog feed lots have been expanded. In these Southeastern States and in these 2 years 2 new packinghouses have been built and 11 existing packinghouses have been expanded. Thus, savings through lower freight rates on grain from the Midwest to the Southeast have brought a healthy and vigorous market expansion for southern livestock farmers, feeders, processors and new jobs for people all along this line of expansion.

In Appalachia the Duke Power Co., offers to invest \$700 million in electric power production that would bring expansion of job opportunities to a tri-State area. The facility is planned as the Keowee-Toxaway plant in Pickens and Oconee Counties in South Carolina. And, who objects? The U.S. Government in the person of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. Secretary of the Interior Udall says that Duke could buy its power from the proposed Government powerplant at Trotters Shoals and from other places. Secretary of the Interior Mr. Udall's proposal comes with poor grace. A Federal power group 2 years ago stopped Duke from building a plant at Trotters Shoals. What Duke proposes would cost the people nothing. What the Department of the Interior proposes would cost the people the price of the Federal powerplant and millions in tax dollars. And, the point is this. A Federal agency delayed the Southern Railway's use of "Big John" grain cars 2 years by forbidding Southern to lower the freight rate. A Federal agency stops private power development to build its own public power empire. Only the voter can trim the Federal Government's stranglehold on private enterprise.

*Fe (m) Dorn*  
 Suburb Address of Secretary Dean Rusk

# EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered a magnificent address on June 23 before the American Foreign Service Association here in Washington.

I commend this timely address, "Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace," to the attention of every Member of the Congress, to the people of our country, and those throughout the world who are striving for a just and honorable peace in southeast Asia—a peace which will end aggression.

## VIETNAM: FOUR STEPS TO PEACE

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here. It is a privilege for me to salute my colleagues, present and retired, of the Foreign Service and to express to you the gratitude of President Johnson and of the American people for a service which is marked by so much competence, dedication, and personal commitment.

Two and a half months ago President Johnson spoke to the world about Vietnam at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Today I wish to talk to you on the same subject—to you who know that such problems have deep roots, to you who have lived through and worked upon such problems before, and to you who know that such matters can gravely affect the future of our Nation and the prospects for general peace.

The struggle in Vietnam has continued since April and indeed has grown the more severe. The harsh resistance of the Communists to any form of discussions or negotiation continues. The effort to destroy the freedom of Vietnam has been expanded. The trial by fire of the people of Vietnam goes on. Their own resistance has been courageous, but the need for American resolution and for American action has increased.

## AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH

The root of the trouble in Vietnam is today just what it was in April and has been at least since 1960—a cruel and sustained attack by North Vietnam upon the people of South Vietnam. Now, as then, it is a brutal war—marked by terror and sneak attack, and by the killing of women and children in the night. This campaign of terror has continued throughout the spring.

Those of us who have not served in Vietnam may find it hard to understand just how ugly this war of aggression has been. From 1961 to the present date the South Vietnamese armed forces have lost some 25,000 dead and 51,000 wounded. In proportion to population, these South Vietnamese losses are 10 times as great as those suffered by Americans in the Korean war, and larger than our losses in World War II.

Even more terrible than these military losses are the cruelties of assassination and kidnapping among civilian officials and ordinary citizens. In the last 18 months, for example, more than 2,000 local officials and civilians have been murdered. When an official is not found at home, often his wife and children are slain in his place. It is as if in our own country some 35,000 civic leaders or their families were to be killed at night by stealth and terror.

These are the methods of the Vietcong. This is the test to which the people of Vietnam have gallantly responded.

Meanwhile, from the north, heavy infiltration has continued. Intelligence now shows that some 40,000 had come down before the end of 1964. Toward the end of that year—well before the beginning of our own air operations against North Vietnam—the infiltration of regular North Vietnamese army units was begun, and important elements of that army are now known to be in place in South Vietnam and Laos, where they have no right to be.

And so we face a deliberate and long-matured decision by a persistent aggressor to raise the stakes of war. Apparently this was their answer to our own repeated affirmation that we ourselves did not wish a larger war. Apparently a totalitarian regime has once again misunderstood the desire of democratic peoples for peace and has made the mistake of thinking that they can have a larger war without risks to themselves. And hence the airstrikes against military targets in North Vietnam.

These actions have made infiltration harder. They have increased the cost of aggression. Without them South Vietnam today would face still stronger forces from the north.

These measured air operations have done what we expected them to do—neither more nor less. For air attack alone cannot bring peace. I cannot agree with those who think it wrong to hit the logistics of aggression. It is the aggression itself that is the wrong.

Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

## EFFORTS TO NEGOTIATE

The other side is obviously not yet ready for peace. In these last months, the friends of peace in many lands have sought to move this dangerous matter to the conference table. But one proposal after another has been contemptuously rejected.

We and others, for example, have sought to clear a way for a conference on Laos, and a conference on Cambodia—two neighboring countries where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam itself. But these efforts have been blocked by North Vietnam and by Communist China.

Twice there has been an effort at discussions through the United Nations—first in the Security Council after the August attacks in the Tonkin Gulf, and later this April, when Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But in August there was a refusal by Hanoi to come to the Security Council. And in April both Hanoi and Peiping made it clear that they would not receive U Thant, and both regimes made plain their view that the United Nations is not competent to deal with that matter.

Repeatedly our friends in Britain, as a co-chairman of the Geneva conference, have sought a path to settlement—first by working toward a new conference in Geneva and then by a visit of a senior British statesman. But the effort for a conference in Geneva was blocked, and the distinguished British traveler was told that he should stay away from Peiping and Hanoi.

Twice in April we made additional efforts of our own. In Baltimore the President offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping call this offer a hoax. At that time the 17 nonaligned nations had appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. This proposal was accepted on our side. It was rejected by Hanoi and Peiping. And some of its authors were labeled monsters and freaks.

The President of India made constructive proposals—for an end of hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. To us this proposal was full of interest and hope. But by Hanoi and Red China it was rejected as a betrayal.

Our own Government and the Government of South Vietnam, in May, suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. This special effort for peace was denounced in Hanoi as a worn-out trick and denounced in Peiping as a swindle. To those who complain that that so-called "pause" was not long enough, I would simply report that the harsh reaction of the other side was fully known before the attacks were resumed. And I would also recall that we held our hand for more than 4 years while tens of thousands of armed men invaded the South and every attempt at peaceful settlement failed.

## HANOI'S RESPONSE

Reports in the first half of June have confirmed that all these violent rejections are in fact what they appear to be—clear proof that what is wanted today in Hanoi is a military victory, not peace, and that Hanoi is not even prepared for discussions unless it is accepted in advance that there will be a Communist-dominated government in Saigon, and unless too—so far as we can determine—American forces are withdrawn in advance.

So this record is clear. And there is substance in Senator Fulbright's conclusion that "It seems clear that the Communist powers still hope to achieve a complete victory in South Vietnam and for this reason

are at present uninterested in negotiations for a peaceful settlement." For the simple truth is that there is no lack of diplomatic procedures, machinery or process by which a desire for peace can be registered—that there is no procedural miracle through which peace can be obtained if one side is determined to continue the war.

As I have said, Hanoi is presently adamant against negotiation or any avenue to peace. Peiping is even more so, and one can plainly read the declared doctrine and purpose of the Chinese Communists. They are looking beyond the current conflict to the hope of domination in all of Southeast Asia—and indeed beyond.

But one finds it harder to understand Hanoi's aversion to discussion. More immediately than the Chinese, the North Vietnamese face the costs and dangers of conflict. They, too, must fear the ambitions of Communist China in Southeast Asia. Yet they are still on the path of violence, insisting upon the forceful communization of South Vietnam and refusing to let their brothers in the south work out their own destiny in peace.

In recent weeks, after 2 months of reduced activity, the enemy has sharply quickened the tempo of his military action in the south. Since early May, major Viet Cong units have returned to the battlefield, and already a series of sharp engagements has shown us that the fighting through the summer may be hard. Setbacks have occurred and serious defeats have been avoided only by the combination of continuing Vietnamese bravery and effective air and other types of support.

Losses on both sides have been heavy. From April 1 to date, we have had confirmed reports of almost 5,000 Vietcong dead, almost 3,000 South Vietnamese, and almost 100 Americans. We must expect these losses to continue—and our own losses may increase.

#### ROLE OF U.S. FORCES

Since March we have deployed nine battalions of fighting men to South Vietnam. Six more are on their way. For as the President said in April, "we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired \* \* \*. We will do everything necessary \* \* \* and we will do only what is \* \* \* necessary."

Our own battalions in South Vietnam have three related tasks. Their first assignment was and is to guard such major installations as the airfield at Da Nang. A second and closely related task is that of active patrol in nearby areas. And the third is to join in combat support of Vietnamese forces—when such help is requested and when our Commander, General Westmoreland, believes it should be given.

American forces so committed will carry with them the determined support of our people. These men know, as all our people know, that what they do is done for freedom and peace, in Vietnam, in other continents, and here at home.

#### SUPPORT FOR U.S. ACTION

In authorizing combat missions for our ground forces in Vietnam, the President acted to meet his constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief. He has recognized the obligations of this Nation under the Southeast Asia Treaty, which the Senate approved by a vote of 82 to 1. He has acted under the joint resolution of August 1964, which passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2—and passed the House with no opposing vote. This resolution expresses our national readiness—as the President determines—"to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States" and "all necessary steps, including the use of armed force" to help Vietnam and southeast Asian members of the SEATO who ask for help to preserve their freedom.

The President has acted on the unanimous advice of the American leaders in Saigon and

his senior civil and military advisers in Washington.

He has acted in full consultation with the Government of South Vietnam.

And he has acted on his own considered judgment of what is necessary at this time to stop aggression.

This decision—like all of our decisions in Vietnam—is open to review by Members of the Congress and open to reversal if it does not have their support. But the leaders of the Congress have been kept in close touch with the situation, and no such prospect should stimulate the hopes of enemies or the fears of friends. For America is not divided in her determination nor weak in her will.

In Vietnam today we face one more challenge in the long line of dangers we have, unhappily, had to meet and master for a generation. We have had to show both strength and restraint—courage and coolness—for Iran and for Greece, for Berlin and for Korea, in the Formosa Strait, and in the Cuban missile crisis. We mean to show the same determination and coolness now.

In 1954 President Eisenhower pledged our support to the Government of Vietnam, to assist that Government, as he put it, "in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." And this determination was reaffirmed again and again by President Kennedy. "We are going to stay here," he said. "We are not going to withdraw from that effort." And that is our position still.

#### FIRMNESS AND RESTRAINT

Now, as in April, as the President put it, "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom that we can command." For it is others, and not we, who have increased the scale of fighting. It is others, and not we, who have made threats of gravely widened conflict. The firmness with which we resist aggression is matched by the firmness with which we will refrain from ill-advised adventure.

A few—a very few—may believe that unlimited war can take the place of the sustained and steady effort in which we are engaged, just as there may be a few—a very few—who think we should pull out and leave a friendly people to their fate. But the American people want neither rashness nor surrender. They want firmness and restraint. They expect courage and care. They threaten no one. And they are not moved by the threats by others.

#### ROLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

This contest centers in the defense of freedom for the people who live in South Vietnam. The sustained and increasing infiltration from North Vietnam has required the measured use of air attack on military targets in the north. We alone cannot determine the future—could we do so there would be a prompt peace. The other side, too, must decide about the future. And we must hope they know—as we do—that increased aggression would be costly far beyond the worth to the aggressor.

The political turmoil in South Vietnam has continued. It is easy to be impatient with our friends in Saigon as they struggle to establish and sustain a stable government under the stress of war. We see there the ferment of a society still learning to be free, even while under attack from beyond their borders.

We must remember that this ancient people is young in its independence, restless in its hopes, divided in its religions, and varied in its regions. The turmoil of Vietnam needs the steadfastness of America. Our friends in Vietnam know, and we know, that our people and our troops must work and fight together. Neither of us can do the work of the other. And the main responsibility must always be with, and is fully accepted by, the South Vietnamese. Yet

neither of us can "go it alone." We would not be there without the urgent request for assistance from those whose land this happens to be. We have a tested faith in the enduring bravery of the people of Vietnam, and they, in turn, can count on us with equal certainty.

#### FORMULA FOR PEACE

The people of Vietnam long for peace. And the way to peace is clear. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles that can provide a just and enduring peace. Those principles, in summary, are:

An end to aggression and subversion. Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny "in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources."

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the independence and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

Now these are the fundamental steps. This is what the arguing and the fighting is all about. When they are carried out, we can look forward, as we have stated previously many times, to the day when relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam can be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the peoples of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

This forthright and simple program meets the hopes of all and attacks the interests of none. It would replace the threat of conquest by the hope of free and peaceful choice.

#### A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

And even while these hopes of peace are blocked for now by aggression, we on our side and other nations have reaffirmed our deep commitment to the peaceful progress of Vietnam and southeast Asia as a whole. In April the President proposed to the nations of Asia and to the United Nations that there be constructed a new program of support for Asian efforts and called upon Mr. Eugene Black to assist them. Now in June this work is underway. The Mekong River project has been given new life. A new dam is ready to rise in Laos. A billion-dollar bank is in the making for the development of southeast Asia. And in Vietnam itself new impetus has been given to programs of development and education and health.

So let us call again on other nations—including the Soviet Union—to join in turning this great region of the world away from the waste and violence of a brutal war. For the hope of Asia is not in relentless pressure for conquest. It is in unrelenting hope for progress—a progress in which rice production could be multiplied manyfold, where the expectation of life could be doubled, the education of the young could be tenfold what it is today, and there could be an end of cholera and tuberculosis and intestinal parasites and other human afflictions.

In April the President offered determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all. And in June we reaffirm that threefold policy.

Aggression has increased, so that determination must be greater than ever.

Discussion is rejected, but our efforts to find a path to peace will not be stopped. We have welcomed the new initiative of Prime Minister Wilson and the Commonwealth conference and regret that it has received so little reception on the other side.

Beyond the terror of the aggressor and the firmness of our defense, we must, nevertheless, look to the day in which many new dams will be built, and many new schools

opened, and fresh opportunities opened to the peoples of southeast Asia. For we must look beyond the battle to peace, past fear to hope, and over the hard path of resistance to the broad plain of progress which must lie ahead for the peoples of southeast Asia.

*Jeffery Cohelan*  
Vietnam: An Answer to Some Probing Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration and respect for the very able editor of the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins. His writing and analysis in numerous fields has made a fine contribution to a new awareness and a better understanding of many public issues.

I was, accordingly, deeply troubled by two of his recent articles: "Vietnam and the American Conscience," February 27, 1965; and "How America Can Help Vietnam," March 20, 1965.

In response to my request for a point-by-point analysis, the Department of State has provided me with a reply which I consider to be thoughtful, informative, and responsive. I include it for our colleagues' attention and considered review:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, July 7, 1965.

HON JEFFERY COHELAN,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COHELAN: Thank you for your letter of June 3, 1965, requesting the comments of the Department on two recent editorials in the Saturday Review, by Norman Cousins. The Department of Defense has also referred to us your letter to them concerning these editorials.

The conclusions in Mr. Cousins' articles are based on a number of assertions which are either oversimplifications or largely inaccurate. The major assumptions on which he bases his arguments are discussed below.

1. "The first fact is that the United States does not have the backing of the Vietnamese people in whose name it went into Vietnam in the first place and whom it is seeking to save today." "In private briefings U.S. officials concede that the large majority of South Vietnamese are opposed to the U.S. presence."

This is not accurate. While many Vietnamese just wish to lead their own lives and do not actively support either the Government of Vietnam or the Vietcong, the majority of the South Vietnamese have already shown that they do not wish their country to be taken over by the Communists and that they appreciate American efforts to assist them in protecting themselves.

Nearly 1 million North Vietnamese refugees rejected communism by moving south in 1954. Over 500,000 Vietnamese soldiers are now serving in the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam—3,411,000 persons took part in the government's municipal and provincial council elections held on May 30 of this year. No political or military leader of note has defected to the Vietcong, even during the days when a number of them were actively opposed to President Ngo Dinh Diem. While it is impossible to prove what exact percentage of the South Vietnamese support or oppose the Vietcong, these facts do indi-

cate that the great majority of the South Vietnamese oppose them.

With regard to Vietnamese support for the American effort in Vietnam, it should be noted that almost all the leaders of all political and religious groups with the exception of the Vietcong have publicly stated their appreciation of American assistance to their country. Some student leaders have criticized some aspects of the method of administering American assistance, but even they have been careful to make clear their gratitude for American support and desire that it be continued.

2. "The second fact is that most of the military equipment used against American and South Vietnam military forces has come neither from Communist China nor from North Vietnam but from the United States."

It is true that the Vietcong use weapons cached in 1954. It is also true that the South Vietnamese, from 1961 until today, have lost over 39,000 weapons, but in the same period the Vietcong lost over 25,000, and so the Vietcong gains have netted them only some 14,000 arms. This is only 10 or 15 percent of their total requirements or, most favorably, only 30 percent of the requirements for their regular, "main force" units alone. The remainder—over 35,000 weapons for the regular, "main force" Vietcong troops, and between 50,000 and 100,000 for the Vietcong irregulars—must, and have, come from outside.

Related to this, it is heartening to observe the trend in weapons losses in 1965. For a long while, the ratio of losses was 3 to 1 in favor of the Vietcong. But this year the ratio is 1 to 1—a favorable sign.

3. "The third fact is that the legal justification invoked by the United States for its involvement in Vietnam has long since been nullified."

The enclosed leaflet entitled "Legal Basis for U.S. Action in Vietnam" discusses this question.

4. "There has been an outpouring of anti-American sentiment not just in Asia but throughout the world—and it would be a mistake to charge it all to Communist manipulation or propaganda."

It is true that the American effort in Vietnam is opposed by the leaders of some countries and by some elements of the population in most countries. Many more leaders and groups throughout the world have expressed concern at the situation in Vietnam, a concern which is shared, of course, by responsible officials in the American Government and by all men interested in peace. However, even many of those expressing concern recognize the necessity of assisting the Vietnamese Government and people. Government leaders of over 60 countries have either publicly or privately voiced support of our policy in Vietnam as compared to the approximately 25 countries which openly oppose it. Thirty-eight countries are now providing assistance to the Republic of Vietnam or have agreed to do so.

5. "The United States did and does have an economic program in Vietnam and Laos but that program lacks grandeur."

The enclosed leaflet entitled "U.S. Assistance to Vietnam" shows the large scope of our nonmilitary aid to that country, and President Johnson discussed our economic assistance in greater detail in an address on May 13, 1965, a copy of which is also enclosed.

6. "The repeated changeovers in the Vietnam Government indicate that the problem of stability is not represented solely by subversion from the north. One way or another, the principle of self-determination, at the core of historic U.S. foreign policy and traditions, does not now exist in Vietnam."

After centuries of domination by Chinese, French, and Japanese it would seem fanciful to expect the Vietnamese to emerge after the signing of the Geneva accords with a

well-trained, experienced and effective leadership group and well-informed, conscientious electorate, both groups able and confident in the operation of governmental institutions with which they have had no previous contact. Is it realistic to require that their Government be as democratic as ours before we will assist them? The progress that has been made since 1954 should not be ignored: the increasing responsiveness of the Government to various groups now becoming vocal on matters of policy, the continuing efforts of the Government to improve the social and economic position of its citizens, and the progress toward an effective administration. One example of their efforts was the successful provincial and municipal elections held throughout the country on May 30.

7. "American newsmen have had a more difficult time in getting unmanipulated news out of Vietnam than out of almost any crisis center in recent years."

Enclosed is an article from the June 20 Chicago Tribune which gives the opinion of an impartial observer on this subject.

Mr. Cousins' conclusion is that we should " \* \* \* involve the United Nations, with all its limitations, to the fullest possible extent."

It should be noted that the United States has attempted more than once to use the machinery of the United Nations to help solve various aspects of the Vietnam situation. When in May 1964, Cambodia complained to the United Nations Security Council of South Vietnamese military incursions into Cambodian territory, the United States proposed that a United Nations peacekeeping body be established on the border. The Security Council sent a mission of three of its members (Brazil, Ivory Coast, and Morocco) to examine the border situation and to make recommendations as to how these incidents could be avoided. Hanoi and Peiping condemned even this limited United Nations initiative in southeast Asia. The Vietcong warned that they could not guarantee the safety of the mission and would not accept its findings.

In August 1964, the United States requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the serious situation created by the North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on two U.S. destroyers in international waters. After hearing the U.S. report of the defensive measures taken in response to these attacks, the Council stated that it would welcome such information relating to this issue as North or South Vietnam desired to make available either by taking part in the Security Council discussion or in a form they might otherwise prefer. The Republic of Vietnam expressed its readiness to offer the Security Council its full cooperation. However, the North Vietnamese maintained that the Security Council "has no right to examine the problem" and replied that any "illegal" decision on the U.S. complaint by the Security Council would be considered null and void by the North Vietnamese authorities.

On June 25, 1965, in a speech at San Francisco on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, President Johnson called upon "this gathering of the nations of the world to use all their influence, individually and collectively, to bring to the table those who seem determined to make war. We will support your efforts," he continued, "as we support effective action by any agent or agency of these United Nations."

The machinery of the United Nations has been extremely valuable in easing tension in many parts of the world. But any peace settlement, to be effective, must be agreed to by parties who are willing to work out and abide by such an agreement. The responses to the President's proposal on April 7 have not given

us any encouragement that Hanoi or Peiping are interested in even considering discussion toward peace.

Referring to reports that Secretary General U Thant had offered to visit several capitals of the world, in Peiping a People's Daily editorial on April 12 had this to say: " \* \* \* Mr. Thant wants to come to China and the DRV (North Vietnam) to seek a settlement of the Vietnam question. Obviously, he is knocking at the wrong door. \* \* \* The Vietnam question has nothing to do with the United Nations" and that "no meddling by the United Nations is called for nor will it be tolerated." Finally, Hanoi's declaration of April 19 noted that it would be inappropriate for the United Nations to intervene in the Vietnam situation.

It is Peiping and Hanoi, not the United States, who oppose an effective role for the United Nations in southeast Asia.

In conclusion, we would like to quote the following paragraph from Mr. Cousins' editorial entitled "How America Can Help Vietnam," which well states the fundamental problems in Vietnam:

"The original problem in Vietnam is represented by an unremitting Communist campaign of terror, assassination, and brutality against the South Vietnamese people and government. The campaign has its origin in North Vietnam but many South Vietnamese are part of the undercover army, known as the Vietcong. What concerns the United States at least as much as the disorders in South Vietnam is the spread of Chinese Communist influence or dominion in southeast Asia."

If the Department can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,  
Assistant Secretary for Congressional  
Relations.

[From the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C.]

#### LEGAL BASIS FOR U.S. ACTION IN VIETNAM

Although Congress in fact has not made a formal declaration of war, the sense of Congress has indeed been expressed. Congressional leaders have been consulted continuously by the administration, and many Senators and Congressmen have made their views known both in private discussions and public speeches in Congress. A joint resolution (Public Law 88-408) was passed in August 1964 by a combined vote of 502 to 2, which stated, among other things: "That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression \* \* \*" and that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia \* \* \*" and that " \* \* \* the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." It has not been considered desirable or necessary to declare war in the Vietnam situation. Should a declaration of war become necessary or desirable, Congress would, of course, make such a declaration, since it is recognized that the power to declare war is solely within the province of the Congress.

Article II of the Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and vests in him the executive power. This article has also been interpreted by the Supreme

Court as making the President the "sole organ of the Nation" in the field of foreign affairs. Thus the President has authority to deploy U.S. military personnel abroad.

Furthermore, the United States and Vietnam are parties to the agreement for mutual defense assistance in Indochina of December 23, 1950, which was concluded pursuant to Public Law 329, 81st Congress. This agreement provides for the furnishing by the United States to Vietnam, inter alia, of military assistance in the form of equipment, material, and services.

The Manila Pact, ratified in February 1955, which established SEATO, included South Vietnam as a protocol state. This treaty was approved by the Senate by a vote of 82 to 1.

A Presidential decision was made in 1954 to extend aid to South Vietnam; President Eisenhower said in a letter to the President of South Vietnam: "The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

#### U.S. ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Since its formation in 1954 the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) has received over \$3.5 billion in U.S. economic and military assistance. This large amount of aid for a relatively small nation (approximately 15 million population) has been necessary because of Vietnam's location on the borders of Communist Asia and the external and internal pressures it must resist to remain independent. In furtherance of U.S. policy in Vietnam both economic and military assistance programs are being carried on.

During the past fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, \$233.9 million was provided in economic assistance, as follows:

Some \$46.8 million for the counterinsurgency program which finances technical assistance and commodities for strengthening rural development, the national police, communications, public works, and similar projects. Under this program U.S. technicians are living in and providing advisory assistance to the 45 rural provinces; commodities such as medical kits, radios, building materials, school equipment, livestock and pesticides are provided for direct use in counterinsurgency and self-help activities at the village level.

There was \$113 million for the commercial import program under which essential import requirements such as raw materials, fertilizer, and some industrial equipment are financed so as to maintain the country's economic foundations. Under this program U.S.-financed imports flow through private commercial channels.

There was \$68.2 million of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities under the food-for-peace program, Public Law 480, of which \$39.2 million (title I) was sold to meet basic needs for foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials, \$26.8 million (title II) was given to support counterinsurgency activities, such as food for resettled families until the next crop harvest, \$2.2 million (title III) was donated for distribution to needy persons by U.S. voluntary organizations.

Some \$5.9 million for improvement of education, health and telecommunications facilities, and other economic development projects under the advice and guidance of U.S. technicians.

Under the military assistance program, over \$200 million of military equipment, supplies, and services were programmed for Vietnam in fiscal year 1964, and some 53,000 U.S. servicemen are currently assisting in training, logistical support, base defense, and combat operations with the Vietnamese armed forces when requested by the Government of South Vietnam, in the war against the Communist guerrillas.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, June 20, 1965]

#### REPORTER FINDS VIET WAR EASY—PROVIDING (By Arthur Veysey, London bureau chief)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, June 19.—Covering the war in Vietnam is easy for a reporter. Stories are everywhere, waiting to be told.

Contrary to often stated charges, reporters willing to leave the air-conditioned hotels, restaurants, bars, and the press conferences of Saigon are free to travel where they like. They find a welcome everywhere among American military men.

Military transportation of all types is open to the reporter for the asking. He even gets preference on scheduled flights carrying troops and supplies. If no scheduled flight is available, the reporter need only wait on an airfield and sooner or later a plane will come along. The pilot happily gives the reporter a lift.

#### TALKS OF CENSORSHIP

There is no censorship. In 2 months moving about the country, I met no restriction that I considered unreasonable. Of course, the reporter is expected to use his common-sense. The reporter who, for example, files a story that planes have taken off for North Vietnam while the planes are still on the way is quite properly shunned by fliers who feel the reporter's irresponsibility endangered their lives.

In Saigon, the reporter lives in a hotel or apartment he provides for himself. Army dining rooms, bars, shops, post exchange shops, and movies are open to him. In Da Nang, the military has taken over a seaside motel for reporters covering the war from there. Elsewhere, the reporter bunks with whatever outfit he happens to be with at mealtime or bedtime. The outfit usually gives him the best it has and charges him 50 cents or a dollar.

#### BACKS PIO'S EFFORTS

Each military outfit has an officer or sergeant assigned as public information officer. By and large, the PIO's do their best to see that the reporter gets the story he seeks, as well as transportation and quarters.

Some reporters accuse the command of using the PIO's as "prison wardens" to make sure reporters "don't get out of line." But my experience is that the PIO's are a much greater help than hindrance to an experienced reporter who understands military ways.

The best PIO's see that the reporter gets to the people with the story, introduces him, and then leaves him to get the facts himself. Sometimes, PIO's who have had unfortunate experiences with reporters sit in on interviews by reporters they are meeting for the first time.

Some inexperienced or lazy reporters expect PIO's to do the work for them and give them the story. Ironically, these same reporters are usually those who protest about "restrictions" and "spoon feeding."

The reporter's worst problem lies in poor communications between Saigon and the rest of the world. The cable service is bad and 24 hour delays are common on big news days. The service is expensive—about 25 cents a word to American cities. This is one of the world's highest press rates. Agencies are arranging their own radio circuits. These would tie into existing cable networks in Manila, Hong Kong, or Tokyo.

Despite the ease with which a reporter can travel within Vietnam, most of the reporters spend most of their time in Saigon. A daily briefing by the command PIO in the air conditioned U.S. Information Service auditorium supplies the raw material for the bulk of stories filed daily from Vietnam.

#### RECEIVE MIMEOGRAPH PAGE

At the briefing, a PIO officer hands out two or three mimeographed pages listing in-



July 12, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180003-7

A3701

cidents. Reporters can ask for further details, but rarely get them. Sometimes, the PIO produces one or two military men directly involved in some incident. These men seem to speak from carefully prepared statements and seem to hedge when asked for further details.

The briefings lead to charges that the military is guiding the news. If a reporter is content with the briefings as his main source of material, the charge sticks. But any reporter is free to seek facts elsewhere and as soon as he leaves headquarters he finds a free world for news gathering.

This is no new situation. It existed in World War II and in the Korean war. In those wars, censorship and long distances between the fronts and the cable head made the reporter's role much more difficult than that which the reporter meets today in Vietnam.

**Jacobus tenBroek**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**  
OF

**HON. PHILLIP BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1940, when the National Federation of the Blind was formally inaugurated, it was no ordinary private group that was set in motion but an extraordinary social movement. The blind people of the United States, long immobilized in the protective custody of almshouse and lighthouse keepers, were at last on the move—and on their own.

One of the men who met at Wilkes-Barre—founder of the national federation and creator of the vision which inspired it—was a 29-year-old California professor named Jacobus tenBroek, whose own blindness had not deterred him from earning a college degree and three postgraduate degrees in political science and law—a fourth degree from Harvard was later to be added.

Dr. tenBroek's own successful struggle for independence stood in stark contrast to the stifling atmosphere of over-protective shelter, enforced dependency and foreclosed opportunity which everywhere prevailed among the agencies and institutions for the blind. The worst effect of this prejudice, in his view, was to isolate these sightless "wards" not only from normal society—and from their self-appointed "custodians"—but even from significant association with one another—by depriving them of the means and responsibility for mutual effort and collective self-advancement.

It might almost be said that for tenBroek the end of sight was the beginning of "vision"—the vision of a democratic people's movement in which blind men and women would no longer be led but would take the lead themselves in their own cause, and in so doing point the way to a new age of individual independence and social integration for all blind Americans.

Born in 1911 as the son of a prairie homesteader, young tenBroek lost the sight of one eye as the result of an accident at the age of 7. Thereafter, his remaining vision rapidly deteriorated until

by the age of 14 he was totally blind. He did not sit long in idleness. Within 3 years he was an active participant and officeholder in local blind organizations in Berkeley, where he went to attend the California School for the Blind. By 1934 he had joined with Dr. Newell Perry, Perry Sundquist, and others to form the California Council of the Blind—a prototype of the State level of the National Federation which followed 6 years later.

From its inception the national movement of the organized blind was shaped in the image of the revolutionary approach to blindness which was preached and practiced with equal brilliance by its founder. It was preached up and down the land, in convention and conference, to blind and sighted audiences alike, in a continuous succession of memorable public addresses stretching over more than 20 years.

But the new philosophy of normality, equality and productivity was not only preached by the NFB's first president during his twoscore years in office. It was also practiced. In the same year in which the Federation was founded, TenBroek received his doctorate in jurisprudence from the University of California, completed a year as Brandeis research fellow at Harvard University, and was appointed a tutor at the University of Chicago Law School. Two years later he began his teaching career at the University of California, moving steadily upward through the ranks to become a full professor in 1953 and chairman of the department of speech in 1955. In 1963 he accepted an appointment as professor of political science at the Berkeley campus.

During this period Dr. tenBroek published more than 50 articles and monographs—plus 3 books—in the fields of welfare, government and law, establishing a reputation as one of the Nation's foremost scholars on matters of constitutional law. One of his volumes—"Prejudice, War, and the Constitution"—won the Woodrow Wilson Award of the American Political Science Association in 1955 as the best book on government and democracy. His other books are "Hope Deferred: Public Welfare and the Blind," 1959 and "The Antislavery Origins of the 14th Amendment," 1951. In the course of his academic career he has been a fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, at Palo Alto, and has twice been the recipient of fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation. In 1956 he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of letters by Findlay College of Ohio.

In 1950 Dr. tenBroek was named a member of the California State Board of Social Welfare by Gov. Earl Warren. Subsequently reappointed three times to the policymaking welfare board, he was elected its chairman in 1960 by the other members, and served in that capacity until 1963.

He has been the president since 1945 of the American Brotherhood for the Blind, an educational and charitable foundation which publishes an internationally circulated braille magazine, the Blind American, and has pioneered in the provision of such notable ventures

as "Twin Vision Books" combined braille and inkprint storybooks.

Dr. tenBroek has served on numerous advisory committees and study commissions for State and Federal Governments; recently, for example, he was a consultant to the Subcommittee on Special Education of the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor, and was a member of the California Governor's Study Commission on Public Welfare.

After 21 years as president of the National Federation of the Blind, Dr. tenBroek retired in 1961 at the time of the federation's Kansas City convention. His resignation did not, however, bring an end to his active participation in the movement of which he had been founder and chief architect. He subsequently accepted a position as the NFB's delegate to the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind. In that capacity he attended the meeting of the world council's executive committee at Hanover, Germany, in the summer of 1962.

I have known Dr. tenBroek for many years. He has been a constant source of inspiration to me as we have worked together in the field of social welfare.

It is with great pleasure that I share with my colleagues in the Congress his address delivered at the second anniversary convention banquet of the National Federation of the Blind:

THE FEDERATION AT 25: POSTVIEW AND PREVIEW  
(An address delivered by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek at the 25th anniversary convention banquet, the National Federation of the Blind, Washington, D.C., July 8, 1965)

Oscar Wilde tells us: "Most modern calendars mar the sweet simplicity of our lives by reminding us that each day that passes is the anniversary of some perfectly uninteresting event." We must approach the task of celebration and review with some pause and some humility, neither exaggerating our importance nor underestimating it. It is my task in this spirit to capsule our history, convey our purposes, and contemplate our future.

The career of our movement has not been a tranquil one. It has grown to maturity the hard way. The external pressures have been unremitting. It has been counseled by well-wishers that all would be well—and it has learned to resist. It has been attacked by agencies and administrators—and learned to fight back. It has been scolded by guardians and caretakers—and learned to talk back. It has cut its eye teeth on legal and political struggle, sharpened its wits through countless debates, broadened its mind and deepened its voice by incessant contest. Most important of all, it has never stopped moving, never stopped battling, never stopped marching toward its goals of security, equality, and opportunity for all the Nation's blind. It has risen from poverty to substance, from obscurity to global reputation.

It is fitting that the anniversary of our own independence movement should coincide with that of the Nation itself. The two revolutions were vastly different in scope but identical in principle. We too memorialize a day of independence—Independence from a wardship not unlike that of the American colonists. Until the advent of the National Federation, the blind people of America were taken care of but not represented; protected but not emancipated; seen but rarely heard.

Like Patrick Henry on the eve of revolution, we who are blind knew in 1940 that if we wished to be free, if we meant to gain those inestimable privileges of participation for which we had so long yearned, then we

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180003-7

July 12, 1965

must organize for purposes of self-expression and collective action; then we must concert to engage in a noble struggle.

In that spirit the National Federation of the Blind was founded. In that spirit it has persevered. In that spirit it will prevail.

When the founding fathers of the federation came together at Wilkes-Barre, to form a union, they labored in a climate of skepticism and scorn. The experts said it couldn't be done; the agencies for the blind said it shouldn't be done. "When the blind lead the blind," declared the prophets of doom, "all shall fall into the ditch."

But the federation was born without outside assistance. It stood upright without a helping hand. It is still on its feet today.

At the outset we declared our independence. In the past 25 years we have established it. Today we may say that the National Federation has arrived in America—and is here to stay. That is truly the "new outlook for the blind."

We have not reached our present standing, as all of you know, by inertia and idleness. The long road of our upward movement is divided into three phases—corresponding to the first decade, the second decade, and the third half-decade of our existence as an organization. Each of these three periods, though a part of a continuum, has had a different emphasis and a different character. Let us look at each of them.

The federation was not born with a silver spoon in its mouth—but, like the Nation itself, it was born with the parchment of its principles in its hand. Our basic philosophy and purposes—even most of our long-range programs—existed full-panoplied at our origin. We were dedicated to the principles of security with freedom; of opportunity without prejudice; of equality in the law and on the job. We have never needed to alter or modify those goals, let alone compromise them. We have never faltered in our confidence that they are within our reach. We have never failed to labor for their implementation in political, legal, and economic terms.

The paramount problems of our first decade, the 1940's, were not so much qualitative as quantitative; we had the philosophy and the programs, but we lacked the membership and the means. The workers were few and the cupboard was bare.

Each month as we received our none too bountiful salary as a young instructor at the University of Chicago Law School, Hazel and I would distribute it among the necessities of life: food, clothing, rent, federation stamps, mimeograph paper and ink, other supplies. So did we share our one-room apartment. The mimeograph paper took far more space in our closet than did our clothes. We had to move the mimeograph machine before we could let down the wall bed to retire at night. If on a Sunday we walked along Chicago's lakefront for an hour, 4 or 5 fewer letters were written, dropping our output for that day to fewer than 25.

The decade of the forties was a time of building; and build we did, from a scattering of seven State affiliates at our first convention in 1950. It was a time of pioneering; and pioneer we did, by searching out new paths of opportunity and blazing organizational trails where no blind man had before set foot. It was a time of collective self-discovery and self-reliance: of rising confidence in our joint capacity to do the job—to hitch up our own wagon train and hitch it up we did.

In the decade of the forties we proved our organizational capacity, established our representative character, initiated legislative programs on the State and National levels, and spoke with the authority and voice of the blind speaking for themselves. In these very terms the decade of the fifties was a

time both of triumph and travail. The triumph not unmixed but the travail was passing.

Our numbers escalated to a peak of 47 statewide affiliates with membership running to the tens of thousands. Our resources multiplied through a campaign of fund-raising. Our voice was amplified with the inauguration of the Braille Monitor as a regular publication in print, braille and tape, which carried the word of federationism to the farthest parts of the Nation and many distant lands.

With the funds to back us up, with a broad base of membership behind us, with constructive programs of opportunity and enlargement, with growing public recognition and understanding, the federation in the fifties galvanized its energies along and expanding front. We sent teams of blind experts into various States, on request of the Governors, to prepare master plans for the reform of their welfare services to the blind. We aided our State affiliates in broad programs of legislative and administrative improvement in welfare and rehabilitation. We participated in opening the teaching profession to qualified blind teachers in a number of States. We assisted in bringing to completion the campaign to secure white cane laws in all of the States so that blind men might walk abroad anywhere in the land sustained by a faith justified by law.

We shared with others the credit for infusing into Federal welfare the constructive objective of self-care and self-support, progressive improvements in the aid grant and matching formula, and the addition of disability insurance. Over the unflinching opposition of the Social Security Administration, we secured the acceptance by Congress, in progressive amounts, the principle of exempt income for blind aid recipients; at first temporary, and finally permanent permission for Pennsylvania and Missouri to retain their separate and rehabilitative systems of public assistance; and we began to lay the groundwork by which our blind workers in the sheltered shops might secure the status and rights of employees. We pushed, pulled, and persuaded the civil service into first modifying, then relaxing, and finally scrapping its policy of discrimination against blind applicants for the public service.

In these enterprises, as against the doctrinaire, aloof resistance of administration, we had the cordial good will, practical understanding, and humane regard of an ever-growing number of Congressmen.

All of a sudden, in the furious fifties, the National Federation of the Blind was very much noticed. Our organizations became the objects of intense attention—if rarely of affection—on the part of the agencies, administrators, and their satellite groups which had dominated the field.

As the organized blind movement grew in affluence and in influence, as affiliates sprang up in State after State, county after county, across the land, as a ground swell of protest rose against the dead ends of sheltered employment and segregated training, of welfare programs tied to the poor law and social workers bound up in red tape, the forces of custodialism and control looked down from their lighthouses and fought back.

"The National Federation of the Blind," said its president in 1957, "stands today an embattled organization. Our motives have been impugned, our purposes reviled, our integrity aspersed, our representative character denied. Plans have been laid, activities undertaken, and concerted actions set in motion for the clear and unmistakable purpose of bringing about our destruction. Nothing less is sought than our extinction as an organization."

No Federationist who lived through that decade can forget how the battle was joined—in the historic struggle for the right

of self-expression and free association. The single most famous piece of legislation our movement has produced—one which was never passed by Congress but which made its full weight felt and its message known throughout the world of welfare and the country of the blind—was the Kennedy-Baring bill.

It is fitting that John F. Kennedy, then the junior Senator from Massachusetts, was a sponsor of that bill of rights for the blind, who gave his name and voice to the defense of our right to organize.

Eight years ago he rose in the Senate to introduce and speak for his bill "to protect the right of the blind to self-expression." He told how some 43 State associations of blind persons had become "federated into a single nationwide organization, the National Federation of the Blind." He declared: "It is important that these views be expressed freely and without interference. It is important that these views be heard and considered by persons charged with responsibility. . . ." He pointed out that in various communities this freedom had "been prejudiced by a few professional workers in programs for the blind." He urged that "our blind citizens be protected against any exercise of this kind of influence or authority to interfere with their freedom of self-expression through organizations of the blind."

The Kennedy bill was simple and sweeping in its purposes: to insure to the blind the right to organize without intimidation; and to insure to the blind the right to speak and to be heard through systematic means of consultation with the responsible agencies of Government.

That bill of rights was not enacted; but it gained its ends in other ways. Lengthy and dramatic public hearings were held by a committee of Congress, at which dozens of blind witnesses both expert and rank-and-file testified to the extent of coercion and pressure brought against them by the forces hostile to their independence. "Little Kennedy bills" were introduced in a number of State legislatures and enacted by some. The forces of opposition called off their attack upon the organized blind and beat a strategic retreat.

Meanwhile, in that second decade, the federation faced another bitter struggle within its own house. Not all federationists were happy with the way the movement was going. There were a few who were decidedly "soft on custodialism," overfriendly to the agencies which opposed us. There were others with a burning passion for leadership and office, an ambition which burned the deeper as it burned in vain. There were still others whose grievances were personal; real enough to them if not substantial in fact. All of these factors combined in the 50's to form a temporary crisis of confidence and collaboration.

But then, as suddenly as it had begun, the civil turmoil ended. Those who had desired power for their own ends or for itself; who had sought to change the character and officers of the movement, departed to form their own organizations. Shaken in its unity, depleted in resources, diminished in membership, the Federation began the hard task of rebuilding and rededication.

That task has been the primary assignment of the sixties, and today, at the halfway point, we may report that it has been accomplished. During the 5 years past we have regained stability, recovered unity, and preserved democracy.

We have found new and dynamic leadership, in the person of a president imbued with youth and creative vigor. We have regained our fund raiser—the wizard of St. Louis—and with him has come the prospect of renewed resources. We have restored and rejuvenated the Braille Monitor, as not only the voice but the clarion call of the federated blind. We have reached across the seas, ex-

From the Lowell Optic, May 15, 1965]

# JUDGE ARTHUR L. ENO: A REMEMBRANCE

The death of Justice Arthur L. Eno, presiding officer of the Lowell District Court, is an occasion of mourning and of remembrance for the city of Lowell and all of her people.

Summed up in this septuagenarian is an era that even now seems so remote, yet contained those ingredients that would be bound together to fashion a living city.

In his birth and youth he attended upon the closing days of another century. As a first generation American he would be caught up in the crucible of the great "melting pot" from which this Nation would draw her greatest strength.

Of his origins among the tenement people of Lowell's "Little Canada" he would ever be mindful. And for these people among whom he was nurtured there would ever be gratitude, respect, and remembrance.

At the age of 25 he served in the conflict hailed as "the war to end all wars." He received a commission as second lieutenant in the Department of the Army. Two years later, in 1919, he returned here to renew his place in the life of the community.

His civic career would be highlighted by his cherished participation in the work of the Lowell Memorial Auditorium Building Commission from 1919 until 1922.

Admitted to the State bar in 1914 at the age of 22 years he would be appointed a special justice of the district court 13 years later in 1927. His career in the judiciary would reach its apex in October of 1944 as then Gov. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL appointed Eno presiding justice of the Lowell District Court. For over two decades Judge Eno lent to the judiciary those energies and talents that had in earlier life earned for him the recognition of a grateful community.

But if Judge Eno's career is to be best understood, it must need be equated in terms of his contribution to the people of Lowell. In the administration of justice his could not be described as an attitude of detached disinterest. While he applied himself in the judicial exercise with impartiality it was never without an awareness of social context. Judge Eno gave countless hours away from the bench in attempting to bridge the gap between fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, caught up in the anxieties and problems peculiar to those with such difficulties.

As presiding justice of the State's third oldest and sixth largest district court he maintained an acute interest in the probationary function of the court—always mindful that the end to which any punishment may be given is correction and reform.

His membership in a variety of civic, military, and social organizations bespoke an abiding interest in the life of the community.

It was in the Lowell Historical Society, however, that Judge Eno would find his one great interest fulfilled. For as one who was to have played himself so prominent a role in the contemporary annals of the city, it was only natural that he should have so highly valued the respect for and importance of local history.

He cherished a prize collection of memorabilia on Lowell and her people. This interest was not static, however. He pursued always an interest, in later years increasingly detached from direct involvement owing to demands of health and age, in the continuing evolution of local governmental, social, and cultural life and activities.

He was in the fullest sense a true child of Lowell. In the 74 years that would be allotted him by providence he would make good use. His emotional experiences would be those of his people, of his city, and of his country and the world.

As a lover of history he proved himself to be a lover of his fellow men.

Thirty-nine years ago Judge Arthur L. Eno sat in Lowell's Memorial Auditorium to hear another contemporary, Frank K. Stearns, address these parting words on the occasion of this city's centennial observance:

"We are but the trustees of a fleeting moment. Our problem so huge and pervasive, will not be solved in the lifetime of any here present. What shall we do, however, during our stewardship must have incalculable importance in the results of a far distant future; and on us, the people of Lowell now in being, devolves a duty as imperative as any that beset the men of 1826.

"Right worthily did they perform their tasks. Right worthily may we, in our different condition, emulate them. They were men and women of vigor; men and women of heart. They were men and women moved in all parts alike as we are, often discouraged, often perplexed, often tempted. They did their work; they held their peace; they faced their crises, and they have left us a priceless heritage. It is our task to go forward as bravely as did they; to deal as resourcefully with what now disquiets or perplexes us, and to rear on the foundation which they have so well and truly laid, a monument which later centuries may not disdain to honor.

"Build the more stately mansions, O, my soul!

As the swift seasons roll!

Leave thy low-vaunted past!

Let each new temple, nobler than the last,

Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast

Till thou at length art free,

Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea."

*Fe On Rumsfeld*  
Yank, Vietnamese Fortress Atop Rock  
Defies Communists

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the second in the series of articles written by Mr. Lloyd Wendt, editor of the Chicago's American who is now in Vietnam on a factfinding mission, reports on one of the special-forces officers of the U.S. Army and his thoughts concerning the war in South Vietnam.

I commend it to the readers of the RECORD:

YANK, VIETNAMESE FORTRESS ATOP ROCK  
DEFIES COMMUNISTS  
(By Lloyd Wendt)

NUI BA DEN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Anyone who believes the war in Vietnam can't be won by our side hasn't talked to Capt. James M. Kennedy.

Captain Kennedy and his 18 special-forces officers of the U.S. Army and Air Force are dug in atop Nui Ba Den, which translates "Black Virgin Mountain." They advise a strike force of Vietnamese volunteers and are building a radar installation in the heart of Vietcong country.

The Vietcong surround this hill, about 60 miles northwest of Saigon. They know all about the installation. For a year they've been trying to do something about this fortress in the sky, without success. The site is vital, near the Ho Chi Minh trails which supply the Vietcong, and near the

Cambodian border, whence the Vietcong gets men and guns from North Vietnam via jungle trails through Laos.

Except for U.S. helicopters, Captain Kennedy and South Vietnamese Lieutenant Lich, the local commander, are cut off by the Vietcong. Yet morale was never higher. The radar goes up in plain view, 3,200 feet in the sky; patrols from Nui Ba Den slip down through the jungle to hit and cut up Vietcong forces, using their own guerrilla tactics.

The time will come, Captain Kennedy predicts, when more bases like this will enable the Government to cut the supply routes and infiltration trails of the Vietcong, and that will be the beginning of the end for the invasion from the north.

"We're going to win this war," says Kennedy, a dark, handsome young Californian from Palo Alto who gave up plans to be a preacher when he joined the special service forces. "We have proved repeatedly that our men can fight and cut up the Vietcong. When we get the strength to shut off supplies and reinforcements for the Vietcong they will dry up. It's that simple.

"The Vietcong aren't supermen. Our patrols from the strike force fight and defeat them repeatedly. Don't believe what you may hear about the South Vietn not being fighters, they are excellent. My life and the lives of my officers depend on them and we couldn't be in safer hands."

Kennedy issues a few quiet orders to the barefoot men in jungle camouflage who are packing supplies up to headquarters from our helicopter. Then he returns to his favorite theme.

"We'll end the war when we make it clear to North Vietnam and to China that what they are trying to do will be unprofitable. It will simply cost them too much. Once they realize that, they'll have to go back behind the demarcation line (at the 17th parallel) and the Vietcong in the south will dry up. We do not have to drive out or kill every Vietcong to win. Plenty of them are discouraged already.

"The South Viet people, on the whole, simply want to be let alone. They go along in this area because they are terrorized by the Vietcong. The guerrillas come out of the jungle, take over a village and kill or threaten to kill hostages unless the village goes along with them. So, until our strength here grows, naturally the village goes along.

"But let me tell you, the Vietcong doesn't attempt to attack us in force. They know better than to get into a real fight."

Captain Kennedy looks like a movie hero in a mountain setting wilder and stranger than anything Hollywood has yet devised. His native forces, under command of Lieutenant Lich, swarm over the mountain, manning guns, mortars, rocket launchers, and booby traps designed for welcoming the Vietcong. The men are small and tough and as hard to see as the tigers and cobras that also inhabit this area. Except when they come out, as of now, to pack up the supplies from the "choppers."

You can reach Nui Ba Den only by "chopper," which the Vietcong diligently attack by gunfire as they come in to land. We came over with Capt. Ernest Strum and his "Rat Pack Six" aboard a UH1B "Huey" chopper. Our machinegunners on each side of the chopper poured some fire down on the Vietcong occupying Nui Can ridge half way up the mountain as we came in. This disturbs the accuracy and enthusiasm of the Vietcong gunners on the ground, Captain Sturm explained. It also checks out the guns, in case they're really needed.

The fortified camp is a bleak stretch of tan rocks and tan sandbags bristling with weapons.

The jungle has been cleared for a quarter of a mile down the slopes to rob "Charlie"—the Vietcong—of any cover should he decide



July 12, 1965

to advance. The strike force men on duty now are Cambodian inhabitants of South Vietnam. Different ethnic groups train and serve together and come to the peak for 6 week tours of duty.

Captain Kennedy and his officers, designated by their green berets, serve continuously, 7 days and night a week, for weeks and months on end. They live armed to the teeth, ready for emergency, as the engineering work they're directing slowly takes shape.

Kennedy is 29, soft spoken but fervent as he talks about the meaning of this South Vietnam war. In 1954 he was graduated from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He also was a lay reader in the Episcopal Church and had about decided to go into the ministry after serving his army time. But then the fire and mission of the special forces got into his blood.

"Where could a man of my age do more?" Kennedy demands, speaking of his bleak life on this hill. "I am responsible for the lives of several hundred people. Where would I get a job like that in civilian life at my age? I know that we are going to save this country for these people. Where could you find work more rewarding than that?"

Kennedy and his men were in special good humor because we were leading a pack of choppers bringing in supplies. It was the first good weather in days.

"We've been living on K rations," Kennedy explained. "Last night, though, we had a feast when our strike force killed and cooked a python. It was delicious. Too bad you didn't get here sooner."

Nui Ba Den is in the heart of war zone C, where operations are of maximum toughness. Not only the Ho Chi Minh trails but the Cambodian and Laos jungle nearby make it impossible for the area to be sealed off from the north. The rice and vegetable growers on the plains are almost defenseless when the Vietcong rolls out from the jungle.

The villagers can only fight when they volunteer to serve in the popular force like that commanded by Lieutenant Lich. Then they have guns provided by the United States, through the South Vietnamese Government, and a base protected by the U.S. forces in cooperation with South Vietnam.

The presence of a base like this, and forces like those under Lich, tell the people of Tay Ninh Province that all is not lost.

Since Nui Ba Den must be maintained from the air, the men are trained elsewhere and flown in. The base is so firmly established that the Vietnamese troops bring in their wives, who have established a small village part way down the mountain. There also, the U.S. forces aided in the building of a new Buddhist pagoda, replacing the one on the mountaintop, which is now a fort. The mountain got its name by the death in ancient times of a young woman dressed in black who was killed by a tiger as she was en route to the pagoda to be married. "There are still some tigers here," said Kennedy. "I saw one only a few days ago."

The Americans, all 19, live in three stone galleries about 10 by 24 each. One is the galley and dining room, the others are for desks and bunks. The cave-like living was enlivened a few hours ago when a krait slithered out from a crack in the walls. It's the Asian version of the deadly coral snake and it was quickly stomped to death.

"Life is rugged up here but we can take it because we know we are doing useful work that is going to succeed," said Kennedy. "There is nothing wrong with the situation in Vietnam that some hard work won't cure. This country is a really rich rice bowl, which is why the Communists want it. When they do get an area they take most of the rice for their troops. This is what will always happen. The South Vietnamese have no wish at all to raise rice for China.

"Once we get the Vietcong off the people's backs by cutting their sources of supply

you'll find this war here will end relatively fast."

As you look around at Kennedy and his men against the backdrop of rocks and guns you realize that the rugged individualism that made America free is still alive in today's young men. You share Kennedy's faith in the tough, tiny South Vietnamese all around you. You know, after you talk with evangelical young Kennedy at Nui Ba Den that this war is going to be won by our side some day.

## Voting Rights Act of 1965

### SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 9, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6400) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in urging the adoption of H.R. 6400, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution, in order to guarantee that the full and free exercise of the right of citizens of the United States to vote will not be denied or abridged.

Events in many parts of the country in recent months have again clearly shown the need for additional Federal legislation to guarantee this right for all Americans.

No one can deny that the safety, and even the lives of our fellow citizens are at stake. In my opinion, the full majesty and full resources of the United States must be exerted to preserve and protect the precious heritage of freedom and equality we all are entitled to enjoy.

President Johnson, in his eloquent address to the joint session of Congress, voiced a deeply moving and forceful call to action on this vital legislation.

I urge that the Members of the House now answer that call with speed and determination—to assure, once and for all, the unrestricted exercise of the right to vote, possessed by every American by virtue of his citizenship in this "land of the free."

Certainly, 95 years after ratification of the 15th amendment is not too early for the Nation to make good on its promise to protect the elementary right of all its citizens to full suffrage.

This bill provides for automatic suspension of literacy or any other tests or devices used to discriminate against would-be voters where less than 50 percent of the voting-age population was registered or voted in the 1964 presidential election.

In addition, it authorizes use of Federal examiners to register and assure the right to vote for all citizens previously unable to exercise that fundamental right.

Another strong feature of this legislation is its outright ban on the poll tax as a requirement for voting in State and

local elections, in the same manner as the 24th amendment to the Constitution, ratified in January 1964, outlawed the poll tax in Federal elections.

All in all, the measure represents a clear, practical, effective, and legislatively responsible way to enable citizens to vote without the fear or threat of discrimination.

For that reason, I hope the Members of this House will pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 without further delay, so that the Congress may again take a leading part in the noble crusade to create a better America, to banish the phrase "second-class citizen" from our vocabulary, and to fulfill the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality for all Americans.

## Our Pacific Partner: Japan

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the day is long past when the Pacific Ocean was merely America's geographic and economic backyard. For, today a Pacific nation, Japan, stands as America's most important customer, second only to Canada. A Pacific State, California, now leads the Nation in exports. Furthermore, two developments of great historic moment and of profound concern to this country are presently occurring in the Pacific Basin—the emergence on the one hand of a dynamic and growing Pacific community of free nations, a community which has become an increasingly important factor in the growth of our economy, and the emergence on the other hand of a militant Red China as a real and growing threat to that community, to our own security, and to world peace. These crucial developments, Mr. Speaker, demand that we turn more of our attention to mending our diplomatic fences in the Pacific.

Nowhere is this more urgent than with respect to our most important partner in Asia, Japan. Now, I have, from time to time, pointed out specific areas of difference between our country and Japan where I felt we could take more positive approaches toward achieving mutually satisfactory solutions. In this regard, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post which succinctly presents a full portrayal of problems affecting our relations with Japan, problems which can and must be solved. Entitled "Our Pacific Partner," this editorial makes the point that yes, this country did very generously help Japan achieve her present eminence, but now we would be very wise to take positive action in good faith to solve our differences with Japan in order to insure our present good friendship for a future in which we are very much going to need it. I think that the point is well taken.



as helped American institutions of higher education is not a new one inside Congress or out, but a House subcommittee has lately been giving the subject its most intensive scrutiny to date on Capitol Hill.

The initiative came from the House Government Operations Committee's new Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs chaired by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin. This subcommittee, established in February, is the latest among several groups formed in the House to consider the conduct and implications of the \$15-billion-plus-a-year Federal research and development effort.

Reuss's subcommittee based its investigation on 3 days of hearings in mid-June and a canvass by letter of some 300 "selected faculty members in a number of fields, as well as university administrators and other distinguished citizens." About 170 replies were received in time to allow the subcommittee staff to put together a compendium intended to provide a cross section of opinion and to publish it as a committee print in advance of the hearings.<sup>1</sup> About half of the 170 responses are represented either by full letters or excerpts. There are plans for including later replies in the published record of the hearings.

#### ANSWERS TO A QUESTIONNAIRE

The subcommittee's "poll" was based on questions grouped under five major headings and, according to the introduction to the committee print, the questions were "compiled from extensive literature which has appeared in the last few years. They seemed to the committee to summarize the salient aspects of the problem."

The questions are clearly not the sort that can very usefully be answered yes or no. Because of the broad focus of the questions and the variety of viewpoints expressed, the results of hearings and the canvass are inevitably inconclusive. But the subcommittee has made a solid contribution by giving serious attention to a number of interrelated questions which have been vexing people in higher education since the rise of big science. And the record of the investigation will be a useful one not least because the net was cast wider in the academic community than usual and brought in a number of people besides those who by virtue of achievement or position are, ex cathedra, perennial witnesses before Congress.

Both the letters and the testimony in the hearings reflect a consensus that the wartime marriage between Government and the universities is, for better or worse, permanent; in general, they support the judgment of the Carnegie survey of 2 years ago that, on balance, the relationship is beneficial to the universities.

This is not to say that on a number of counts there were not expressions of serious concern. The quality of teaching undergraduates are getting was the subject of fairly widespread although certainly not universal worry. Sharpest concern was directed to the independent liberal arts colleges, which are seen as suffering, indirectly at least, from emphasis on research in the universities.

Most pessimistic perhaps was one unnamed member of the faculty of the Columbia University graduate school of business who said: "Small liberal arts colleges are threatened not (so much) by Federal grants as by economics of scale in higher education, which raises the question whether these institutions are viable."

Much more typical was a view that liberal arts colleges must and can do more to create

an atmosphere in which research—particularly in the sciences—is an integral part of education, as has been successfully done in a number of the "prestige" colleges.

It was generally recognized that the key to the problem is faculty and that able young scholars in fast-moving fields will not emigrate to the colleges and stay there if such action forecloses their chances for a research career. Most of the suggestions for mitigating the isolation of the researcher in the liberal arts colleges implied establishment of new or modified Federal programs as well as cooperative programs among institutions. The main recommendations were for arrangements to lighten the characteristically heavy teaching loads in the colleges, to make it easier for college faculty to use the library and laboratory facilities of the universities and national laboratories, and to enable college scholars to work periodically for sustained periods with leading men in their fields.

As for undergraduate education in the universities, it was acknowledged that teaching may be left largely in the hands of graduate teaching assistants. This can be unsatisfactory, but a fairly strong segment of opinion held that this is not necessarily a bad thing. One who expressed this latter view without sounding like Pangloss was C. H. Braden, a professor of physics at Georgia Tech.

"Perhaps the principal consideration," wrote Braden, "is the increasingly large fraction of the college age population that attends college. This, coupled with the increase in population, means that colleges must employ mass production techniques that deliver a good quality education to large numbers of students. In the future it will be a graduate degree, rather than simply a college degree, that will be a mark of academic distinction, and it will be in the graduate program that the close contact between faculty and student will be achieved which formerly marked the undergraduate program also."

"This new order of things need not imply an inferior undergraduate education. On the contrary, many mass production colleges offer programs of the highest competence. The generally accepted way to offer such a program is to place the undergraduate program under the close supervision of distinguished faculty members who have an interest in undergraduate teaching, and such faculty are not rare, and then provide much assistance in the way of junior instructors, technicians, and student assistants. Moreover, many young instructors are superior teachers because of their enthusiasm and close contact with problems of current interest."

On the final morning of the hearings when several representatives of research-supporting Federal agencies appeared, the discussion turned to agency regulations which have prevented graduate assistants working on federally funded research from teaching. The National Science Foundation, an agency with a special sensitivity to university opinion and with room to maneuver, because of its responsibilities for education as well as research, has revised its rules so that its graduate-student beneficiaries can do some teaching, and the general trend among the agencies would appear to be toward more flexibility. A crucial factor in the matter, however, would appear to be university insistence that graduate students teach as part of their regular program and teach well.

Criticism of teaching standards elicited a counterattack from Lloyd V. Berkner, director of the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies, Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, who was expressing a hard line not uncommonly held by senior men in the hard sciences.

"In my opinion," said Berkner, "the complaint against the teaching in our great re-

search universities arises primarily from students (and their indulgent parents) who would like the university to be a kind of advanced high school—a continuation of the sheltered life the student has enjoyed at home.

"The university must assume its students are mature individuals who attend because of their dedication to learning and desire careers in a society that today fully depends on sufficient education. The basis of that learning must be books and a modern, rigorous curriculum. This means that the teachers at the university level, though dedicated to the highest standards of scholarship, can only be supplementary guides to a student who is forced to assume responsibility. These qualities of the institution will themselves assure the quality of the undergraduate (and graduate) education which it offers. To mature its students, to give them self-discipline, the university must be tough. The intellectual competition is high, and to develop qualities of independent decision and leadership expected of university graduates by society, the university cannot hold the student's hand or cajole him. In such an environment the success of the student must depend primarily upon himself—his intellectual qualifications, his growing self-discipline, his inquiring mind, his self-development toward qualities of leadership."

"Graduate students have to teach because they must learn to teach and they have to start somewhere. Moreover, the teaching experience by the graduate student requires that he think more clearly, formulate his presentation more precisely. Teaching is an important part of his own graduate experience—equally important, it is conducted under the tutelage and guiding hand of men who, through their own research in creative frontiers, are holding themselves in the forefront of today's science."

Berkner also doubts that humanistic studies are suffering as the result of Federal expenditures on science. He argues that Federal support of scientific research has released large sums for the development of nonscientific university activities. In addition he feels that research in the "hard" social sciences—those that submit to quantification—should be supported by the Government, but that the "soft" social sciences "uncontrolled by experiment should be left to private support."

#### ANOTHER VIEW

A diametrically opposed view was expressed by one in quite a different field and stage in his career, Norman S. Care, an instructor in the philosophy department at Yale.

Care argues that there is little money available to support research in the humanities. He points out that humanists are on the short end of a salary differential between them and scientists and, on top of that, a scientist can usually count on the Federal Government's underwriting summer research while his colleague in the humanities often must teach to piece out his salary. Another hurdle to research in the humanities, says Care, is generally heavier teaching loads for humanities faculty compared with the sciences.

"The upshot," says Care, "is that academicians in the humanities, are not only materially deprived, but also made out to be professionally second rate. There is a form of status attached to having research grants, and lack of opportunity to secure such aid is sometimes interpreted as a sign that one's discipline is somehow not respectable in a vigorous and practical society. I have encountered this kind of artificial ranking among both students and faculty in my experience on the campuses of two major State universities and one large private university. However, it is worth adding that this form of grading is not common on campuses with strong traditions of education in the liberal arts."

<sup>1</sup> "Conflict Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education," available from the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

July 12, 1965

A political scientist, whose name was withheld by request, wrote complaining about grants to the social sciences. "Apparently only research projects which are completely susceptible to quantification and computerization will be considered by NSF," he said. "This appears to be an artificial limitation which can only have an adverse effect on the kinds of research undertaken by political scientists. I have no quarrel with quantification where it is applicable, but strongly disagree with the notion implicit in such a requirement that only that which can be measured and counted is significant."

On the fundamental matter of concentration of Federal funds for university research in science projects and in a relatively few institutions, there seemed to be virtual unanimity among witnesses and those who responded to the questionnaire that there should be no major redistribution of funds or discontinuance of the project grants which have been instrumental in creating the present pattern. Rather, it appeared there was fairly strong sentiment for putting additional funds into programs which will improve the research atmosphere in liberal arts colleges and the quality of instruction and research in universities which fall distinctly short of excellence. Sentiment for the greater use of "institutional" grants to strengthen aspiring universities seemed strong, although there was equally firm espousal of the principle that Federal funds should not be spent without reasonable assurance of significant improvement in the institution receiving them.

One interesting excursion into high policy occurred on the final day of hearings when it was asked if many of the problems being discussed might not be solved if education programs were consolidated under the jurisdiction of one agency. On hand were Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, Commissioner Mary I. Bunting of the Atomic Energy Commission, and representatives of NSF, the National Institutes of Health, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Bureau of the Budget. While the subject was not pursued at length, the clear consensus was that present diversity is regarded to be of advantage to both the Federal Government and the universities.

The task of the subcommittee is now to review the record and decide what, if any, action is in order. Congressman Reuss says he emerged from the hearings disturbed by the patent fact that, "Unless we do something about it, there's going to be a very considerable shortage of university teachers in the next few years. Maybe closed circuit TV and computers can do the job (the inevitability of such measures was mentioned during the hearings), but if we do short-change the undergraduate and graduate students in the universities we are not only going to hurt them, but we're going to hurt the Nation too."

He said that the investigation had confirmed in the minds of the subcommittee that the Federal research program is indispensable, "but some nagging questions present themselves."

"Many research grants do take teachers off teaching.

"The Federal research program has resulted in a great imbalance between a few favored universities with graduate departments and the other thousands of colleges and universities in the United States.

"Teachers have lost caste \* \* \* and Federal research grants have in part made it so.

"There is an observable imbalance between the support of science on the one hand and of the social sciences and the humanities on the other."

REUSS has no ready solutions for these problems, though he does say "We must make up our minds whether we want the Federal Government to support the humanities the way it supports science."

## RECOMMENDATIONS COMING

The end product of the subcommittee investigation will probably be a report recommending legislative and administrative changes. The subcommittee is supposed to deal with problems which transcend departmental programs and committee lines of authority. Specific action would appropriately be left to the committees with authorization authority.

Examination of the conflict between Federal research programs and goals for higher education was the first venture of the new subcommittee, and the experience of wrestling with a formidable subject does not seem to have daunted it. Next in prospect, although not scheduled, is consideration of problems in such areas as transportation technology, sewage and waste disposal, and building construction, which are important to the public but have been the object of relatively little federally financed research. An effort would be made, says Reuss, without batting an eye at the far-flung implications, to look at the relative payoff of various Government research programs.—John Walsh.

Thirty Thousand Communities  
Without WaterEXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an excellent discussion of the water problem in rural America.

The article was written by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. It appeared in the July issue of Rural Electrification:

THIRTY THOUSAND COMMUNITIES WITHOUT  
WATER

(By Clyde T. Ellis)

The above is the title of a booklet recently published by the Farmers Home Administration. I think the fact that the adjective rural does not appear before the word communities is significant. It would be superfluous. Even city folks would know at once that the reference must be to rural communities, for it would be inconceivable to them in this age of "space walks" and "moon shots" that an urban community in the United States could be without a water-supply system.

This statistic in the booklet's title dramatically underscores the wide gap between city and rural life in much the same way as did the statistic used in 1935 relating to the lack of electric service in rural areas. It seems to me that the statistic does something else too. It virtually cries out for a massive, full-scale program directed at eliminating the disparity in water service.

According to FHA, all of the 30,000 communities without water systems have less than 2,500 population. About 15,000 are under 100 population. Moreover, one out of every four farm homes and one of every five rural nonfarm homes do not have running water. This figure cannot be interpreted to mean that the 75 to 80 percent of rural homes which have water necessarily have a dependable and safe source. Many are contaminated now. In many sections, cisterns, wells, and ponds often go dry and there is frequently the possibility of contamination.

tion. As the water table keeps dropping, the necessity of hauling water during periods of sparse rainfall is becoming more widespread. Nitrates from fertilizers, detergents, and waste products pose a constant threat of pollution to shallow wells which thousands of people in rural areas still must rely on. Cities, on the other hand, are able to dig deep wells or buy equipment to purify otherwise unsafe water. But little towns and villages, and rural areas generally, usually do not have sufficient financial credit to develop adequate sources and treatment plants.

Rural American cannot attain its rightful place within the Great Society—which President Johnson sets forth as a present-day objective—until something major is done to solve the water problem. There are hopeful signs of progress in this direction. At present, many bills are pending in Congress which would provide increased amounts of loans and grants to rural areas.

One bill (S. 1766) which Senator George Aiken, of Vermont, introduced in early April is concerned entirely with meeting the need in rural areas. It would authorize \$25 million annually in grants of up to 40 percent for rural communities of under 5,000 for the purpose of development and improvement of water systems. In addition, it would provide for grants to help communities prepare plans. The Farmers Home Administration would administer the program, combining it with its on-going water system loans activities. FHA's loan-insuring ceiling would be lifted from \$200 million to \$450 million, making a great deal more funds available for water system loans.

Lack of adequate pure running water is a big hindrance to rural areas development, to the war on poverty, to the rural electrification program, to wholesome rural living.

Lack of modern water service is also a serious handicap to rural areas, not only in their efforts to attract new, job-creating enterprises but also to provide recreation and other facilities for their residents.

I am sure that you will be interested in following the course of this legislation. Our legislation and research staff will keep you of the rural electric systems informed.

One aspect of Senator Aiken's bill which seems extremely significant is that 93 of the 100 members of the Senate have signed it as cosponsors. This certainly is an impressive indication that the problem of rural water supply is being recognized as one of deep national concern.

While legislation can do much to help bring water service to rural America, as legislation helped to bring electricity, it alone cannot do the job. It will take concentrated local group action and leadership and know-how. Many of our rural electrics are already furnishing this type of assistance. Many more, I am sure, will want to lend their support to continue the progress of rural America toward modern living.

*Fe (Un) Rumsfeld*  
The Vietnam War: A Wild West Scene  
Amid Death, Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following report on the situation in Vietnam, the first of a series written by Mr. Lloyd Wendt, editor of the Chicago's American, will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD. Mr. Wendt, a news-

paperman of long experience and great ability, is on a factfinding mission in Vietnam. His first-hand observations are of particular value in gaining up to date perspective on the situation in that strife-torn country:

**THE VIETNAM WAR: A WILD WEST SCENE  
AMID DEATH, TERROR**  
(By Lloyd Wendt)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—This beleaguered city is 12 hours away from Chicago as time flies, half the world away geographically, and about 200 years back as wars go. To get the feel of it, try watching Daniel Boone on TV, or some other good Indian war story from America's colonial past.

That's the trouble with this war. There are the good Indians and the bad Indians and it's very hard telling which is which. The bad Indians, called the Vietcong, have come down from the north, recruited some locals, and are everywhere.

In this city, a Vietcong (Communist) who looks like anybody else, may blow up the place next door, or garrote you as you ride in a pedicab. He may lead his forces out of the darkness to murder, with sadistic torture, every man, woman, and child in a village a few miles away. Then he fades into the jungle or the mangrove swamp.

The Vietcong fights from ambush, hits and runs, controls one-third of the population in this country of 14 million by his terror. He can't be made to stand and fight, except when he chooses.

Professional U.S. fighting men grow grim when they speak of the Vietcong. Our side, the good Indians—the South Vietnamese, are excellent fighting men, too. But you can't fight the Vietcong when you can't find him.

When you come down at Tan Son Nhut airport from Chicago, you know at once there's a war on, and it isn't going too well.

This is the capital, yet from your plane you can see the smoking wreck of an Air Force C-123, shot down by Vietcong ground fire to crash through three homes only 15 miles out. Sixteen dead. Two miles north of the airport a B-57 Canberra has just been shot down.

At the airport are troops, sandbags, concrete revetments, planes armed with bombs, and other planes returning from a strike, their drag chute blossoming behind them as they land.

A block from where you put up with the troops, in what is humorously called a hotel, they are setting up posts before a wall of sandbags where tomorrow some Vietcong terrorists will be shot. Not all of them get away.

In the jungle, the swamps of the delta, and on the central highlands, the war is strictly from the American wild west. Troops and posses hunt the raiders. Emboldened by the monsoons, which keep the cloud cover heavy and the planes away, the Vietcong increases his attack. He gets fresh forces and supplies from the Communist North across more than 1,000 miles of jungle border, and another 1,000 miles of coastline. The jungle is so thick a plane can crash into it and never touch ground.

Here in Saigon, of course, there's a slight variation on the wild west theme. It's more like Kipling. A backdrop of the exotic east, millions in the streets in this war-glutted capital. Soldiers and barbed wire everywhere as Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, new boss of the Vietnam Republic, tightens security.

The trim, pretty Vietnamese women in pajama-like gowns are everywhere, conducting the town's vast business, including the construction of streets and buildings. The war-boom is huge and thrilling, and it's worth your life to try to cross a street against Renaults, motorbikes, and pedicabs.

At headquarters, where the increasing thousands of American advisers plan new techniques to aid our Viet allies, men mut-

ter about the bombings. The deadly attack on My Canh restaurant is fresh in their minds and there is no doubt there will be more such attacks. A jovial major exclaims: "Nine more days and a wakeup and I go home." The wakeup is his actual day of departure. He can't stop talking about it.

The advisers are professionally optimistic. But no one asserts that the war is going well. Despite the step-up in the U.S. commitment, there is no discernible improvement. You gradually realize that this is because we're re-fighting the French and Indian wars in Vietnam and it will take some time before our modern know-how is adapted to the ancient problem.

Yet, things may not be as bad as they first seem. An Air Force (SAC) strike first called a bust turns out to be at least a minor success. In a battle not far from the capital, at Dinh Tuong, a Communist defector enabled our side to ambush the bad guys. We killed 30 and captured 29, including the entire politburo [high command] of the province.

And the Air Force finally got through to deliver 16 strikes, despite the weather, to aid our entrapped force in at Tou Mourong. Maybe that force, written off as lost, can still be saved.

The capital is by turns glum and optimistic. At night you can hear the sounds of howitzers and mortars only 15 miles away. Still, the Vietcong have been 15 miles away many times. There are no lines, no fixed positions, and no assault in force can possibly come to Saigon.

All the bad Indians can do is hit and run keep up the war of fear, slip in men and supplies from the north as attrition sets in, and hope the United States gets discouraged and tired.

If the United States gets too discouraged and tired and withholds its support, that will be the end for Saigon and South Vietnam. But nobody in his senses around here thinks that could happen. So, Saigon grimly carries on the fight, and also does business as usual, only five times as much.

**Professors Were To Blame for Berkeley  
Mess**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been printed and discussed about the situation at the University of California, known as the Berkeley mess.

Recently Dr. Rafferty, State superintendent of public instruction in California, who is also a member of the board of regents of the University of California, made a talk before the Commonwealth Club of California. Flashes from that address of June 25, as published in the Commonwealth of July 5, follow:

"PROFESSORS WERE TO BLAME FOR BERKELEY MESS—REAL FIGHT IS OVER UC CONTROL"—DR. RAFFERTY

(From Address by Hon. Max Rafferty)

In a book I wrote a few years ago, I listed the following almost certain outcomes of the kind of life-adjustment, progressive education we were conducting in practically all California schools:

1. Violence: When an educational philosophy is almost completely permissive—lets

a child express himself at any cost, holds we must avoid frustrating or inhibiting the child in any way, then the result is indiscipline, discourtesy, and doing what comes naturally; this means violence, for a human animal is a violent one.

2. Immortality and obscenity: When we educators began replacing "Evangeline" and "Silas Marner" with "Catcher in the Rye" and James Baldwin's latest, we were just asking for what we have since gotten.

Some English teachers, fascinated with so-called "avant garde" literature, assigned it indiscriminately to children, and sowed a whirlwind of literary filth which has since grown into wholesale obscenity on the part of too many young people. Once you agree that there are no positive standards, no eternal truths, no lasting values in life or in education—then anything goes.

**CHILDREN MUST BE CIVILIZED**

3. Decline of personal morale: It was the new behavioristic psychology which warned educators and parents against any interference whatsoever with the divine right of the child to express himself—even if this self-expression turned out to be at the expense of those around him and at the cost of school discipline generally. The outcome was predictable: the beards, the sandals; the long, lank hair; the general aura of unwashed disinhibition.

Education exists to take kids who are naturally disposed to nature in the raw, and show them finer things in life to aspire to. When you permitted an educational philosophy to take over in this State which holds that the words "the good, the beautiful, the true," are all meaningless—that everything in life is relative—why, you were just asking for what you got. And you certainly got it, did not you?

4. Contempt for law and the democratic process: This country has just as large a percentage of decent, law-abiding youngsters as it ever had. But the minority, who always got into trouble in the past, are getting into worse trouble now.

**"EASY WAY OUT," PREVAILING DOCTRINE**

Why? The doctrine of "permissiveness"—another name for the "easy way out"—took over both the homes and the schools two decades ago, and produced the least repressed and worst behaved generation this country has ever seen.

For months now the entire country has been gazing unbelievably at Berkeley. In the sacred name of free speech, police cars have been bashed in and campus police held prisoners.

The university president resigned, and then un-resigned. So did the chancellor. The board of regents, charged with determining university policy, became so palsied at the mere possibility of bruising some beatnik's constitutional rights that for months it was afraid even to bring the matter to a vote.

The people of California are outraged. No other word fits. Almost every letter I get these days winds up with: What's causing this Berkeley mess?

College kids have always raised Ned. But they have always been punished too—until now. Now they get away with everything from kidnapping to outraging public decency, and nothing happens to them.

**PROFESSORS BLAMED**

Why? Not due to the administration or the regents. But because of the professors. They're responsible in two ways—directly and indirectly.

Too many of them openly or tacitly endorse disorderly, or even criminal conduct by their students. We got nothing but obstruction from those professors who controlled the different faculty senates and committees.

The professors fouled things up indirectly because the administration and some regents



July 12, 1965

were afraid some professors would quit. Many of the regents are appalled at the prospect that several of their more prestigious professors may resign out of sympathy for the poor downtrodden filthy speech boys, deprived of their sacred right to bellow obscenities over the campus public address system.

#### PROFESSORS WON'T GO

Not me. I'm the only regent except Dr. Kerr who is a professional educator—I know my own kind. And I know we leave a teaching job voluntarily only when offered a better job elsewhere. We leave it to better ourselves—not to show sympathy for some loud-mouthed showoffs who are doing their best to disrupt the scholarly pursuits of a great university.

For every professor who will quit if we apply discipline at Berkeley, two will quit if we don't.

"Why," you ask, "should intelligent, scholarly professors act in such strange ways." Well, one thing they're trying to achieve is control of the university by the faculty, instead of by the people. They're seemingly enamored of the European way of running a university. Over there, you know, the professors are the university. They make the rules. They establish policy. They hire and fire each other. Here, we Americans have long held the somewhat quaint idea that a people's university ought to be run by the people, not by stray groups of employees or students.

#### WHO'S GOING TO RUN UNIVERSITY?

The real fight at Berkeley is over who's going to run the store. Are the people, who spend hundreds of millions to subsidize and support the university, going to turn the institution over to the inmates?

Here's my recipe: (1) Put all discipline in the chancellor's hands and out of the faculty committees. (2) Tell the chancellor to do whatever is necessary and let him do it. (3) If the chancellor can't or won't do it, fire him and get one who will. (4) If any students or professors don't like it, remind them that they can easily go elsewhere.

#### REAL STUDENTS HAVE REAL GRIEVANCE

After law and order have been reestablished, the job has just begun. There is a very real if somewhat incoherent grievance on the part of the sincere and sober students with which all of us should concern ourselves.

This is a loss of identity, erosion of self-respect, increasing inability to identify as an individual with a "multiversity" numbering almost 28,000 souls. It's a kind of creeping facelessness.

One Berkeley undergraduate wrote me recently: "I sit in a lecture class with 600 other students and I'm No. 327. The professor's lectures are piped in electronically. I never see him. The tests are collected automatically, corrected automatically, handed back automatically. I engage in group activities, group health services and group recreation. I came to the university to find myself—to learn how to become a person. Instead, I've become a number."

We're all to blame. We've let the university become a factory. We've been too willing to let George do it.

Always and forever, we who cherish the proud title of Californians will keep a special place in our hearts for the Berkeley campus. To us, she and she alone will always be "Cal." She belongs, thank God, to us all. Too great to be defiled by fools. Too wondrous ever to be turned over by default to any others save ourselves alone.

#### ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (C. K. Gamble): Too many eggheads on Berkeley's teaching staff? Answer. Most professors are eggheads in some ways. But I'm more concerned with lack of balance in certain fields, particularly economics, political science, and to some extent history.

Question. (Wilson E. Cline): Character of Berkeley different from other U.C. campuses? Answer. Yes; no other campus like it. Low-cost housing adjacent where many nonstudents and hangers-on live; at other campuses it's 15 miles away—makes it difficult to mount spontaneous demonstrations after driving 15 miles and thinking about it.

Question. (Richard Johnston): Student unrest justified? Answer. For vast majority—yes. They've lost touch and can't call it "alma mater" now. It was easy to identify with Berkeley years ago. This is important—look back to your own college days; aren't the things you remember the ways in which you identified with your university? But the rioters had no grievance. They were put there. The brochure they published on the regents was a slick job—very clever—done professionally, not the work of students, nor financed by students.

Question. (John A. Rowe, Jr.): Should students use campus as soundingboard? Answer. Yes, but there should be both sides by men of equal glamour—not Gus Hall, brought in with trumpets, and answered, 6 months later, by a kindly, if doddering, local professor.

### The Fifth Freedom

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an address by Mr. Robert R. Gros, vice president, public relations, Pacific Gas & Electric Co., San Francisco, Calif. This address was given before the Advertising Association of the West in Honolulu, Hawaii, and was entitled "The Fifth Freedom." Mr. Gros points up the importance of the incentive system which has produced the abundant life in America, and compares it with the Socialist systems operating in other countries.

He gives ample warning against the creating of a welfare state, which would reduce us to a country of mediocrity. He states that we must fight the concentration of power in Washington, or in any State capitol, and that we must hold taxation within reason. He states that excessive taxation erodes freedom. I highly recommend the implementation of his recommendations:

One of the best things that I can say to you fellow advertising people today is that even the Russians finally have decided it pays to advertise. As you probably have read, on May 4 Pravda printed an article which said, among its otherwise doctrinaire verbiage, that advertising brings "higher turnover, faster selling, and other economic benefits." Pravda astonishingly went on to say: "The famous expression 'advertising is the motor of trade' no doubt has sense."

That expression does have a great deal of sense because you and I long have known that advertising functions as the yeast of American business. And it is American business and American productivity that underpin the good life in this country.

What's been happening to this good life of ours? Or, put another way, is our good life in jeopardy of being taxed and warehoused to death?

When I walked into this room today, it occurred to me that the gratifying attendance at this luncheon quite possibly might come from a rumor among the Walkikil outrigger set that I was going to reveal the low-down on the new income tax revisions or that I had some hot poop on the Federal budget.

Recently we've had some tax cuts, thank heavens. However, the 1966 Federal budget stands at about \$100 billion—no small figure in even the space age. Necessarily that budget provides more money just to service the national debt's interest than the entire Federal budget amounted to as recently as 1940. Clearly there has been no decrease in the Government's spending—just more revenue produced by our prosperous economy.

I can't begin to comprehend a budget of nearly \$100 billion. In the first place, the Federal budget's very language is a tongue foreign to my business-trained ears—it is characteristic Federalesse, replete with double talk and, in parts, I suspect, with the purpose of confusing rather than convincing. Nor can I really comprehend the astronomical figure of 100 billion anything. I do know, though, that there have not been nearly 100 billion seconds since the birth of Christ. To spend \$100 billion you would have to get rid of a million dollars a week for more than 19 centuries.

So long as I'm free to speak my mind, my conscience forces me to cry out in protest when our Government plunges even further into the Grand Canyon of debt to provide so many things we Americans don't need, don't want, and can't afford. I'm sure you'll agree that we're being taxed today for many projects we'd be better off without. In other words, we're getting more government than we need. It would be good if we actually got all the government we pay for.

But big government isn't about to remove its fingers from my pocket or your billfold. A huge, impersonal tax machine doesn't have much regard for the dignity of the dollar you and I earn. It's not much consolation to see a sign, such as the one displayed in a New York bank, that reads: "Remember, part of all you earn belongs to you."

The fact is that America has become the House Beautiful, with wall-to-wall taxation. And unless we take positive action now we could well lose our mansion of freedom.

Now let me assure you that I'm neither a pessimist nor a cynic. To the contrary, I'm the kind of optimist without whom the poor old pessimist wouldn't know how happy he isn't. America is still the greatest nation ever to exist on this planet—but we didn't get that way through phony economics or through the big spending bureaucrats in Washington.

Our United States was not built by government ukase. It was built by the energies of a self-reliant people who did things for themselves and through cooperation with each other. It was built by a people who pushed across the western plains in wagon trains, who created homes in the wilderness through log-rolling bees, who reclaimed arid lands by their own efforts—whose missionaries sailed to these beautiful islands, bringing civilization with all its boons and problems. I admire them the more if the old saying is true that they "came to do good and stayed and did well"—for they obviously did both. Yes, our forebears were men and women who constantly demonstrated their capacity to fend for themselves. And they worked for honorable profit. This is the American way—this is the way of freemen.

As a natural consequence of our heritage, plus the harsh facts of today's cold war, to most Americans the concept of freedom means political and religious liberty. The inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" were declared as God-endowed by the free and farseeing statesmen who founded our Republic. Soon after, they



If either of these were adopted as an amendment to the Constitution, it would be provided that one house of a State legislature could be apportioned on a basis "other than population" provided that the voters of the State approve of such an arrangement by referendum.

This proposal is one of several approaches designed for the purpose of attempting to reverse the dictate of the Constitution as presently written and as first ruled upon in concrete situations by the Supreme Court in the case of *Baker v. Carr* in 1962 and in other cases since that time. In these and other cases it was held in substance that one person's vote should have the same weight as another person's vote without regard to an individual's station in life, whether rich or poor, man or woman, highly educated or poorly educated, without regard to religious belief, to political belief, to race or color or national origin, and without regard to the section of a State in which he happens to reside. It is precisely the struggle for the foregoing objective that consumes many chapters of the history of representative government. Time and time again devices have been forced or foisted upon the people having the effect of producing governmental coercive authority on the basis of some consideration "other than population," devices for the objective of either disallowing any vote at all or for the purpose of reducing some individual's vote to a minute fraction of another individual's vote. It is with reluctance that the melancholy fact must be recognized that such propositions are still seriously argued in approaches such as that contained in the Dirksen proposal.

The Dirksen proposal only pretends to provide for apportionment in one house on some basis "other than population" while, in fact, it provides that one sector of the population shall have more representation than another similar sector of the population; it in fact provides that because of differences in people, whatever those differences may turn out to be, one person's vote shall be counted as much more important than another person's vote. The distinction may be based on place of residence, so that an individual is given much greater representation because his home is surrounded by several acres of forest or farmland. The distinction may be based on artificial boundaries, such as those marking off a town, city, or county, so that an individual is given much more representation because he happens to reside within such boundaries. Whatever the reason or justification or excuse, there is no escape from the fact that the scheme provides for more voting weight for one class of persons than for another class of persons, all of whom make up the population.

There seems to be no doubt that the purpose of the Dirksen proposal is to provide greater representation for the so-called rural inhabitant and smaller representation for the so-called urban inhabitant; and by providing that such disproportionate voting strength shall come into existence only by approval of all the voters in a referendum, a bow is made to the concept of "one man, one vote." In other words, the creation of a body of the legislature on the basis of 10 votes for 1 person and one-tenth of a vote for another person should be all right and acceptable if such an arrangement is adopted on the basis of "one man, one vote." The Dirksen proposal tells the American people that they should vote away a large part of their voting rights. In terms of the procedure set up by the Dirksen proposal, it is exactly the same as if the amendment provided that freedom of speech shall be abridged if a majority of the voters in a State so provide, or that freedom of worship, or freedom of assembly, or freedom of petition for redress of grievances, or any one of them, shall be abridged or limited or reduced if not eliminated in any State in which

a majority of the voters so determine in a single election. Such a principle opens up a route by which all individual rights can be tampered with, and it should be rejected for that reason alone.

But, finally, the so-called rural elements should look more deeply at the threat to their own rights which is imbedded in the Dirksen proposal. By allowing representation in one house on a basis "other than population," a large Pandora's box is opened because no limitation is placed on what the other basis or bases shall be. In an attempt to increase power, such standards as per capita income could be used, or amount of taxes paid to the State per capita, or amount of wealth owned or controlled, or amount of formal education attained on the average by each citizen. Every one of these standards would fall under the category of a basis "other than population," resulting in one class of citizens having more voting strength than another class. Every one of them has existed or been proposed in the past as a standard for disproportionate voting strength. And every one of them would today favor the so-called urban voter and reduce the representation of the so-called rural voter. In the matter of political power, such temptations should not be dangled before the urban population. Under a banner of favor to them, rural voters should not be deceived into supporting a method by which their own future voting equality is placed in jeopardy, for a constitutional amendment looks not only to today but also to the far future, and there is no certainty that future urban political forces shall be always self-restraining.

Today's urban dweller is more often than not the son or daughter or grandson or granddaughter of a rural dweller. There are ties that bind them all so inextricably together that there is very little substance to the rural-urban conflict so-called; but these filial ties will weaken as time passes, leaving rational standards as the principal limitation on the struggle for political power. Whatever the other differences between individuals, the principle that each person is the same in the voting booth is one which enhances the dignity and solemnity of each individual and is most likely to produce the feeling of stability that breeds confidence in American institutions. Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Prince Georges Democratic Forum strongly opposes not only the specific provisions contained in the Dirksen proposal but also any other proposals embodying the philosophy that one citizen's vote in any State is to be counted either as more or less important than another's, no matter what the justification expressed for such discrimination; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to such State and Federal elected officials as determined by the board of directors of the Prince Georges Democratic Forum.

*Frederic O. Rumsfeld*  
Reds Routed From Vietnam Rice Bowl

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Chicago American, Mr. Lloyd Wendt, who is in Vietnam on a factfinding mission, reports in the third of his series of articles on an important victory of the South Vietnamese against the Vietcong and the efforts to recon-

struct and rehabilitate the area involved. Of particular interest are Mr. Wendt's observations on the relations between the Americans in Vietnam and the people of that country:

#### REDS ROUTED FROM VIETNAM RICE BOWL

(By Lloyd Wendt)

GO CONG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—We are deep in the delta rice bowl, where cleanup operations against the Vietcong have yielded 255 Vietcong killed, according to reports. Our sector, Go Cong Province, the smallest in Vietnam, is quiet now.

Col. Roy Preston, of Miami, Okla., commanding the advisers here, and his assistant Maj. Earl Scales, of Baraboo, Wis., already are busy with their pacification and reconstruction chores.

Go Cong, on the Mytho River, appears in a jubilant mood as the news comes through of government victories. Just a few days ago the South Vietnamese troops ambushed the Vietcong in nearby Mytho Province and captured Muoi Ha, the Vietcong province chief and his entire politburo. It is hailed as one of the most impressive of government victories and has been followed by the cleanup today.

There will still be some Vietcong in this area, they once controlled about 30 percent of the villages and hamlets. But the tide of war in this area is running against them, and this is where the rice comes from.

"Now our own local guerrillas can be more active," said Capt. Anthony Harring, of Cairo, N.Y., an aide to Preston. "Where the Vietcong had control they heavily taxed the farmers. Those who have been freed are glad to have their freedom. They'll fight to keep it."

In this area the Vietcong had maintained control by raiding villages for hostages, by recruiting some of the young men, and by the continued aid from former Viet Minh, men who fought the French and who object to any form of central government.

The disorganization in the area is a heritage of the French regime. Few were educated, there was little local self government, and in the past resistance to injustices was left to the Viet Minh, or Communists, trained by leaders from the north.

Now the Americans are trying to change things, setting up schools, aiding in village reorganization, and bringing in technicians to aid with the rice problems. The area is on a salt dome and the salt water regularly comes up to attack the crop.

Consequently, Da Cong province raises only one rice crop a year. The salt can be defeated, it is believed, by the creation of fresh water reservoirs.

The acceptance of the new American program is obvious. The people clearly want to be friends. They are taking advantage of the hamlet reorganization program. And the "Chieu hio" program, the government's plan for welcoming converted Vietcong back into village life, seems to be working. There now are 45 Vietcong men and 18 women in the district jail, getting reorientation training. All will be put to work on reconstruction projects, and ultimately they'll get their freedom.

"They are well treated," said Preston. "This makes sense. When word gets out that the Vietcong who gives up is treated well there'll be an increase in conversions. We won't have to kill 'em or drive 'em out to win."

The provincial chief, Lt. Col. Nguyen Vlet Thanh, was not about to exhibit his Vietcong prizes, however. Thanh was too occupied to take visitors to the jail. So Preston's word for it that prisoners are not mistreated was accepted.

Preston is proud that in Go Cong Province there was an election, democratic style, May 31. "There were nine candidates for six

July 12, 1965

provincial council offices," he said. "Considering that the Vietcong tries to kill elected officers, this is pretty good. There was an 89-percent turnout of the registered voters. Try to match that in one of the United States."

We were invited to a hamlet reorganization meeting in the home of the chief of Long Ong, population 318. The meeting was attended by the chief and his advisers, Preston and his aids, Gail Friemark, the American district rehabilitation adviser, 39 chattering children, and one black duck, which marched solemnly about the room throughout the proceedings.

It was the task of the village officials to prove that Long Ong had met six conditions of rehabilitation. As it turned out, the hamlet had held an election, it had purged itself of the Vietcong, it had a flourishing yellow Buddhist pagoda, and it otherwise qualified.

The village officials, in their western business garb, were pleased to learn that Long Ong would henceforth be recognized as loyal to the government. When the meeting concluded each picked up his gun, the armed guards outside dispersed, and the women came out of the kitchen to resume their household chores.

"These people want democracy once they've learned how to get it," said Preston. "We have excellent relations with the local population. This province will ultimately be completely restored to the government."

Preston certainly proved that Americans are welcome here. The big, sandy haired Oklahoman towers above the Vietnamese as he goes about the village and the Province with minimum protection. He'd make an easy target for the Vietcong. "It's perfectly safe," he insisted. "Naturally, we are careful, and we don't go about at night."

Those are the chores the soldiers have when the fighting stops. If a single day's demonstration of their work is an adequate criteria, the Americans here are doing OK.

## Poverty War Saps American Spirit

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the various ramifications of the so-called war on poverty have brought to light waste, Democratic partisan activity, mismanagement, and disregard of State and local prerogatives. Recently, my friend, William H. Rentschler of Illinois, who was a Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate in the April 1960, primary, reported on a startling activity in the war on poverty which should shock every Member of this House.

I commend this article to my colleagues in the House and to the American public:

#### POVERTY WAR SAPS AMERICAN SPIRIT

(By William H. Rentschler)

I was jolted by a phone call the other day. It came out of the blue from a Princeton University lad who told me he was lining up summer jobs for college students, and asked if the company which I head could find a place for a student or two.

I told him I thought he was a little late—well into July—to be talking about summer-time employment.

"Oh," he said brightly, "I'm talking about next summer."

That really floored me.

I said I couldn't possibly tell what our needs would be a year from now and suggested that he get back in touch with me in April or May of 1966.

Then I asked, "Are you looking for a job for yourself next summer?"

"No, sir," came the reply. "I'm trying to find job opportunities for other students."

My next question was, "Well, why can't they get in touch with me direct?"

"I suppose they could, but that isn't the way this program works," he replied.

"What program?" I inquired, by now a little baffled. "Are these students hiring you to find summer jobs for them?"

"Oh, no, sir, this is part of the, uh, part of the poverty program, you know, the poverty program the Government is running."

When I regained consciousness, I had just enough strength left to ask still another question: "Do you mean to tell me that the poverty corps is sending you around now to find jobs for college students next summer?"

"Yes, sir."

All I could do was splutter. "Incredible. Do you get paid for this mission?"

"Oh, sure, and it's really helping me out this summer," the young man said earnestly. "I can use the money."

Perhaps I lack understanding. I may well be dumb, unsympathetic, and hardhearted. Maybe my arteries and attitudes are getting brittle.

But I can't for the life of me see any possible justification for this sort of activity in—of all things—the poverty program, or, for that matter, in any other Federal appendage. Back 15 or so years, I myself was a Princeton undergraduate. Despite the contrary opinion of my children, that really wasn't the "Dark Ages." Students were just as hard-up then as they are now.

But if they needed jobs, they went out and knocked on doors and made their own phone calls and sold themselves without sending around in their behalf gray flannel envoys and/or budding undergraduate bureaucrats at taxpayer expense.

Poverty czar Sargent Shriver really ought to be ashamed of himself.

I freely admit that my impression of the whole "poverty" effort from the very beginning has been skeptical at best and downright negative at worst.

Demagogues and shrewd politicians down through the ages have scaled the heights by pledging to wipe out poverty and create an idyllic, unscarred land of milk and honey. But history shows that Government-guided poverty programs invariably fail to do the noble job and just as invariably add seeds of bureaucrats and precinct captains to the public payroll.

This Nation has come closest to eradicating true poverty—not through an endlessly inventive sheaf of Government programs—but rather because the unique American free enterprise economy has brought more people more material well-being than any system yet devised by man.

The Johnson-Shriver "attack" on poverty differs little from all the rest, except perhaps that it is more wide-ranging, more ingenious, and embellished more by massive modern-day public relations technique. It is something of a political grab bag, a fountain of cascading dollars over which Democratic politicians are already scrapping and snarling. Stripped bare of its glitter, it is a program calculated to elect and then perpetuate incumbent administrations and politicians, and only secondarily will it get at the tough, demanding job of really reducing the rolls of the poor.

It is both cynical and unfair to make lavish promises and lift the hopes of the genuinely needy while Ivy Leaguers and other leaguers are paid to ferret out next summer's jobs for presumably able-bodied, even if not filthy rich, college students.

In one of John Steinbeck's books, a tired old man who long ago led a wagon train westward across the American plains and mountains to the Pacific offers this doleful lament:

"Westerling has died out of the people. Westerling isn't a hunger any more. It's all done. \* \* \* It is finished."

Perhaps the spirit that shaped America is "all done \* \* \* finished."

I hope and pray and believe in my heart it is not.

But if a trace of the old daring remains, the poverty program and others akin to it, by damping the inborn initiative of pliable, impressionable young people, is surely stifling the spirit and character which made America great in its "wagon train" era and which must prevail to make it greater in this "age of astronauts and automation."

To nurture what remains of that flickering spirit, we must challenge and stir and uplift our youth. We must inspire them to dream. We must hold out the promise of opportunity—not security. We must instill the hunger to serve mankind—not be served. We must demand the best they can give—and not readily accept less.

Through the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver rekindled for one brief shining moment the rare, irresistible spirit of a younger America. But now he has lost it. What confronts us this day is no job for bureaucrats or planners, for Federal moguls or Federal agencies.

It is plainly a task and stubborn challenge for each individual American.

## Research Subcommittee Has Made a "Solid Contribution" to Evaluating the Impact of Federal Research Grants on Higher Education, Science Magazine Says

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in its July 2 issue, the magazine *Science*, published a comprehensive article on the investigation by the Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs of the impact of Federal research grants on our colleges and universities.

The author of the article, John Walsh, comments that:

The subcommittee has made a solid contribution by giving serious attention to a number of interrelated questions which have been vexing people in higher education since the rise of big science. And the record of the investigation will be a useful one not least because the net was cast wider in the academic community than usual.

The article goes on to provide a concise account of some of the most important statements and findings in the subcommittee's investigation.

Because I believe this matter will be of interest to many Members and particularly to institutions of higher education in their home areas, I include the full text of the article:

#### SUBCOMMITTEE SURVEYS EFFECTS OF FEDERALLY SUPPORTED RESEARCH ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The question of the extent to which Federal support of research has harmed as well

ute the fact that there is of necessity a basic discretion vested in the police officer in dealing with this kind of situation. Afterward, no one can fairly judge whether the pounds of pressure exerted by his fist or by his billy were scientifically calculated to be the least amount of physical force needed to subdue this person. And also in dealing with violent crime, the police officer who knows that his own life is in jeopardy has legal discretion to take any reasonable means to protect it. And in such measures he deserves the support of the community which he serves.

But there are some situations which aren't in these categories. If the police have a prisoner with his arms handcuffed behind him and four officers on the scene, it ought to be possible to bring him into a precinct station intact. Furthermore, I have often tried to figure out exactly how you would go about it if you were deliberately undertaking to develop a 4-inch cut on the top of the head by "falling on the precinct steps." But in the early months of my administration as Police Commissioner, I saw some reports which literally described this somewhat fantastic feat as having been accomplished by a shackled prisoner.

This doesn't mean that every error made by a police officer is fatal or requires discharge. He deals with difficult and complicated problems. But if he deserves correction, he should have it, as in any other walk of life. As a matter of fact, any situation where the truth is allowed to be covered up by official reports is productive of the greatest amount of hostility toward and disregard for law. This is a major source of problems in the area in which we are speaking.

Direct investigation of important civilian complaints by the civilian head of the police is essential. The community relations bureau or complaint bureau should be manned by permanently assigned officers chosen for intelligence and courage enough to face hostility inside and outside of the department. Their reports should go directly to the civilian heads or heads of the department.

Secondly, the administration of the department should make it known that it will not tolerate the institution which is best known in police circles as "alley court." Our law never has allowed for alley courts. The Constitution does not allow for them. But it has been an institution. There are police officers who are sincerely convinced that unless they are allowed to bolster their authority in the street by administering punishment by fist or billy when they feel it is necessary, they cannot maintain peace and order.

The law prohibits this. Our total society prohibits this. Punishment is not the function of the police. It is the function of the courts. The function of the police is to detect and apprehend and to bring into court for punishment. "Alley court" is ordinarily used against a minority group. If it is used, it inflames the attitude of that group—in this case the Negro population. It produces the cries of "police brutality." And it deprives the police department of the most important ally that it can have—the support of the law-abiding populace residing in the core areas of the city for the police department's war against crime. There are relatively few police officers who believe in "alley court." They cannot be allowed to perpetuate an utterly indefensible institution.

Thirdly, the administration of the police department should open and maintain means of communication between the police department and all sections of the community it serves. Particularly in this decade, this must be done with the Negro community and its leaders. Be available to meet with them to exchange information and to try earnestly to resolve problems. If you are conscious of a problem, don't

wait for someone else to call. Initiate the discussion yourself.

What else do you do to achieve equal law enforcement? Here is a checklist of specific measures designed to achieve equal law enforcement and more effective law enforcement:

1. Keep police-community communications open.
2. Provide for direct staff investigation of civilian complaints and final decision on them by the highest civilian authority in the police department.
3. End "alley court."
4. Identify police troublemakers on the force and transfer them to noncritical jobs.
5. Ban "trigger words" in police action.
6. Enforce politeness in the giving of traffic tickets.
7. End investigative arrests.
8. Increase law enforcement in high crime precincts.
9. Drive out organized crime—and pay particular attention to its manifestations in the core areas.
10. Actively seek cooperation of all citizens for law enforcement—particularly in high crime areas.
11. Make certain that equal opportunity exists for all in police department—recruitment, assignments and promotions.
12. Ban the use of police dogs in core area police work. A dog companion for a single patrolman on a lonely beat may be useful. That same dog at a racial demonstration is a symbol of race hatred.
13. Integrate police teams—particularly make certain of the integration of details employed at racial demonstrations and the careful selection and integration of "ready forces" employed to respond to street conflicts.
14. Seek more police officers.
15. Seek better training for police officers.
16. Seek better pay for police officers.

I make no suggestion that any of these items are ones which can be the subject of a simple order and then be forgotten about. Least of all do I suggest that by listing these items I would necessarily claim that any police department had completely accomplished them. I do suggest that if they are sincerely held objectives, if they are tenaciously sought, then significant progress can be made.

These are policies of the Police Department of the city of Detroit, as I have reviewed them recently with the present Police Commissioner. They have been since the beginning of Mayor Cavanagh's administration. While the inauguration of these policies brought many predictions of dire results from prophets of doom inside and outside the police department, the results have been quite different. During Mayor Cavanagh's administration Detroit has done significantly better than the national FBI crime trend index.

By what I have said it must be obvious that I believe wholeheartedly in civilian control of police forces. There are many proposals for achievement of this, including civilian review boards. The best mechanism in my view, by far, is that of a civilian police administration—dedicated to vigorous, effective, fair and equal law enforcement—which has both responsibility for law enforcement and control of police practice.

The great majority of police officers, I believe, want no part of any abusive practices. They want and will support higher standards of training, of pay, and of performance in their profession.

Federal assistance in relation to some of these local police needs should be sought—particularly, I believe, in relation to police training. Recently in Washington I proposed the founding of a National Police Training College, organized, staffed, and financed at a level to make it comparable in police work to a West Point or an Annapolis.

Such an institution could do more to enhance the level of local law enforcement than any other single program I can think of.

And now, finally, a word about a slogan which seems to me to be tremendously important. I would like to see more public concern about police work—not less. I would like to see citizens feel that they have a tremendous stake in how their police department operates and feel a duty to support it in the proper discharge of its duties. I would like to see them willing to "get involved."

What about the woman murdered in Queens last year within sight or hearing of 38 people—not one of whom called the police? They didn't want to get involved.

What about the police officer engaged in a desperate struggle to prevent a would-be suicide from throwing himself off an expressway bridge recently in Detroit? When the officer asked for help in trying to lift the man to safety, one citizen gave it. Others passed by, not wanting to be involved.

What commentaries these are on our civilization.

The effort to involve citizen support for law enforcement is basic in a democratic society. Without it the police effort can degenerate into an occupation army attitude. With citizen support the police are the community's right arm in fighting the evils which make city living difficult.

Let me quote briefly from a speech I made to a national police-community relations conference in 1963:

"In precinct 10, our most difficult precinct, we had a community relations meeting just a month ago that was supposed to be a regular quarterly meeting, but it wasn't a very ordinary affair. There were 450 citizens (90 percent of them Negro) seated in the police garage—the only place we had that was big enough to accommodate them. They were seated on hard folding chairs, and they stayed there for 3 hours to talk in detail with the precinct inspector and the officers in the precinct about law enforcement in the precinct. During the course of this 3-hour meeting there was not one complaint about discrimination or brutality.

"The most popular man in the meeting was the precinct inspector who was bringing the most vigorous kind of law enforcement to the 10th precinct. What they were asking for was more enforcement in their particular block or neighborhood, rather than wanting to have the police removed. They were telling us where stills were, or where blind pigs were operating, or who was pushing people around in their neighborhood. This is the kind of information which makes the law enforcement job so much easier. We gave out 10 department citations for dramatic work of assistance to the police on the street. For instance, two gunmen had gone into a bar, held it up. Three of the Negro citizens who were at that meeting, when the gunmen left with the swag, went out the door after them, chased them, caught them, and held them until the police got there. Now, we don't really recommend that with civilians in our town. But after it was done, we couldn't very well do anything but say that it was an act of considerable courage.

"What we do encourage is having people tell us when they see things going on. Most of the other nine citations were given to people who had done that. They had seen something suspicious that ended up being the commission of a crime. Through this we get help for law enforcement.

"The sort of communication that was represented by that precinct 10 meeting, magnified a thousandfold, is the essence of democratic participation in law enforcement. Such avenues of communication have to date served in this great industrial area to let us move toward further progress in human relations without the eruptions of violence

which plagued other great cities this past summer. May this progress continue."

In general I think I can report that such progress still continues.

Basically, all good law is the codification of the wisdom and morality of past ages. It is never safe to deal long with practical problems without relating them to moral standards. Let me end with such a statement. In Romans, chapter 13, we find these lines:

"Owe no man anything, but to love another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.

"For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

"And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore take off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."

#### REMEMBERING ERNIE PYLE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there are many persons throughout the Nation who recall the warmth and the clarity of the war reporting of Ernie Pyle, whose vignettes of war from the level of the average GI were so unforgettable.

It was 20 years ago, on April 18, 1945, that Ernie Pyle died of a sniper's bullet on Ie Shima. Earlier this year I offered a bill, S. 1673, proposing a commemorative stamp. Ernie Pyle was a native of Dana, Ind., and a graduate of the Indiana University School of Journalism.

Today an article in the Washington Daily News, which Ernie Pyle once edited, recalls the circumstances surrounding his death. It also reveals the existence in the Scripps-Howard files of 15 unpublished Ernie Pyle columns which will appear in the papers of the chain in the days ahead. I shall look forward to reading those dispatches, so long after.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FIFTEEN UNPUBLISHED COLUMNS BY ERNIE PYLE RELEASED

(By Jim G. Lucas)

It was April 18, 1945.

In newspaper offices all over the world the bell on the wire service ticker jangled for an incoming bulletin. It read:

"At a command post in Shima, Ryukus Islands, April 18—Ernie Pyle, war correspondent, beloved by his coworkers, GIs and generals alike, was killed by a Japanese machinegun bullet through his left temple this morning.

"The famed war correspondent, who had reported the wars from Africa to Okinawa, met his death at 10:15 a.m., about a mile forward of this command post \* \* \*."

#### ONLY YESTERDAY?

That was 20 years ago. To the men who knew and fought with Ernie at their side, to the millions who read him daily and felt

they knew him because he made the war real, it hardly seems that long.

Millions of others know him only as a legend.

Ernie had landed on Ie Shima with the 77th Infantry Division just the day before. He had a hacking cold. On the way over, he put on a jacket for the sea breeze was brisk.

"I'm the old one-hoss shay," he told Bill McGaffin of the Chicago Daily News. He was a health-worrier—constantly fussing about his ailments.

The operation on Ie Shima was expected to be a snap. The island is only a dot off Okinawa. But later, when Ernie saw a GI get blown up by stepping on a mine, he remarked to Milton Chase of Radio Station WLW, Cincinnati:

"I wish I were in Albuquerque."

#### STRATEGY TALK

Ernie arose early on the morning of April 18, he chatted briefly with Maj. Gen. A. D. Bruce, commander of the 77th, at his command post on Ie Shima.

"I gave him the latest dope and our future plans," the general recalled later. "I was surprised and pleased that he came to the same conclusions I did."

That was Ernie. He knew war intimately. About 10 a.m., he set out in a jeep with Lt. Col. Joseph B. Coolidge of Helena, Ark., commanding officer of the 305th Regiment, to look for a new command post site. Three others were with them: Maj. George Pratt of Eugene, Oreg., Dale Bassett of Baush, Colo., and the Jeep driver, John Barnes, of Petersburg, Va.

Except for an occasional mortar round, or a red flag indicating a mine, it was quiet, routine.

Another Jeep preceded them. Ahead were some trucks.

#### MACHINEGUN

As they neared a junction outside the little settlement of Ie, a Japanese machinegun opened up from the left, cutting up dust in a nearby field. It was too close for comfort. Why the gunner had let the other vehicles pass and zeroed in on Barnes' no one will ever know. Barnes braked sharply. The men piled out and took cover in a ditch. The gunner had a clear field of fire.

Pyle, Coolidge and Barnes were safe as long as they hugged the ground. Pratt and Bassett were a little forward. Ernie and Coolidge raised their heads. Pyle spotted Pratt and asked:

"Are you all right?"

Those were his last words.

#### ERNIE WAS DEAD

"The Jap let go again," Coolidge wrote later. "He had had time to adjust his sights. Some shots chewed up the road in front of me and ricocheted over my head. After ducking, I turned to ask Ernie how he was. He was lying face up, and at the time no blood showed, so for a second I could not tell what was wrong."

Ernie was dead. He had been hit in the left temple. Coolidge called to some soldiers nearby to ask for a medic. None was available, but it didn't matter.

Ernie was buried in Ie Shima. A few years ago, I watched a representative of the Japanese Government place a wreath on the site of that grave. Later, his body was removed to Hawaii.

#### UNPUBLISHED WORK

The Scripps-Howard Newspapers continued publishing a number of Ernie's columns after his death.

"We believe he would have wanted us to; as a great reporter, as a great newspaperman, and a great person, he would have wanted his stories to go through," his editors explained.

But 15 of Ernie's columns were never pub-

lished, and have remained in our files for the past 20 years. Now we are publishing them for the first time starting next Monday in the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers.

We want them to serve as a memorial. But, more than that, we would share the Pyle magic with those younger Americans who never had the privilege of knowing him.

#### FOLLOW-UP

In these last 15 stories, Ernie writes about 42 Americans. We have tried to locate as many as we could to find out what has happened to them over the years. We have been surprisingly successful, all things considered.

These were among the last men Ernie talked with. They still speak of him with warmth and affection; the shock of his death still lingers. Some recall he had a premonition of death; he felt his string had run out. They have mementos of him; a cigaret lighter, a short-snorter, or some GI joke they will never forget.

Not surprising, many feel they were the last he talked to, the last to see him alive. They sometimes feel they were his best and closest friends. This is not surprising either. Ernie was that kind.

Ernie Pyle has been dead for 20 years. But he is still very much alive, as the stories we have dusted off, and the memories of his GI friends, will show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—H.R. 8775—making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

*Fe On Mansfield*  
VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Saturday Evening Post of July 17, there appears an article with Washington dateline by the distinguished journalist Stewart Alsop. And in the Washington Post of July 11, there appears a feature with a Saigon dateline by John Maffre, a reporter who is in the tradition of courage and straightforwardness and dedication which the American press corps in Saigon has built in recent years.

Both articles deal with the critical Vietnamese situation. Both shed additional light on the complexity of the problems which confront us there. It is not and has never been, as is now becoming all too apparent, an open and shut affair, a simple do or do not proposition and these articles are most useful in stimulating the kind of thought which is essential if we are to deal with the situation effectively. For that reason, I commend them to the attention of the Senate and ask that they be included at this point in the RECORD.



There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post,  
July 17, 1965]

**A TIME OF TROUBLE**  
(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The mood of this city has changed sharply in the last 6 months.

Last January, in the wake of Lyndon Johnson's massive triumph at the polls, there was a confident feeling that, with this remarkable man running things, nothing could go really wrong. Now the confidence has been replaced by an uneasy, foreboding sense that the President and the rest of us may be in for a time of great trouble.

On the domestic front, the uneasiness is like "a cloud no larger than a man's hand." Its chief source is a single speech, delivered in early June by William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Martin listed a series of 12 "menacing likenesses" between the present economic situation and the situation in 1929, before the great depression.

Martin was careful to point out differences too, but the "menacing likenesses" were much more striking. The President's economic seers, like Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler and Economic Adviser Gardner Ackley, remain guardedly confident. But the Martin speech was followed by a sharp, nervous drop in stock prices. And the uneasy feeling persists that the present boom, the longest since the 1929's, cannot last forever, and that some sort of economic trouble surely lies ahead.

On the foreign front, the clouds are visible—they seem to bicker and blacker and uglier every day. The Dominican affair has raised the old specter of Yanki Imperialism in Latin America, and elsewhere in the world America-hating is becoming an international pastime. Charles de Gaulle's France, which used to be known as "America's oldest ally," is acting more and more like a hostile power. NATO seems to be coming apart. But the real source of the dark sense of foreboding that has been eroding Washington's self-confidence is Vietnam.

There is a tendency nowadays, especially abroad, to suppose that President Johnson is an impulsive fellow. In fact, he made his decision last February to bomb North Vietnam only after long delay and much agonizing. All his advisers told him the same thing—that otherwise the Vietnam war would be lost. Thus the President had no real choice.

All his advisers hoped, and some certainly believed, that American air power alone would be enough to bring the Communists to the conference table in a mood to negotiate. As noted in this space about a year ago, it is a favorite American illusion "to suppose that air power is an adequate substitute for what the British call the PBI, or Poor Bloody Infantry." It is clear by now that, as in Korea and again and again in the Second World War, the job the Air Force started will have to be finished, if it can be finished, by the PBI.

What has happened is what a minority of the President's advisers feared might happen. When we resorted to our most available instrument of military pressure—air power—the North Vietnamese Communists resorted to theirs: human bodies. But they have done so in a clever way. An overt, full-scale, conventional invasion of South Vietnam, like North Korea's invasion of South Korea, would have had a shock effect, which might have produced a really massive reaction.

Instead, the invasion of South Vietnam has been by slow stages, and thus largely invisible. The North Vietnamese have simply increased, very steadily, their commit-

ment of organized units to the Vietcong. The process has now reached a point where it is "academic," as a U.S. military spokesman in Saigon has said, to distinguish between indigenous Vietcong guerrilla forces and organized units from the north, because there are so many of the latter. But this invasion has produced no shocked reaction, here or abroad.

This covert invasion has in turn forced the President to commit American ground troops to combat. The process is sure to go further. Behind closed doors, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has talked of the possible necessity of committing to South Vietnam as many as 300,000 U.S. troops. He has said flatly that a war on the scale of the Korean war "may have to be accepted."

Consider the differences between the Korean war and what "may have to be accepted" in Vietnam. The Korean war was a response to overt aggression, a war officially sanctioned by the United Nations, supported by this country's allies and fought when this country had a virtual atomic monopoly. A Korean-scale war in Vietnam, if that is in store, will be a very lonely war. We will have no United Nations sanction, no support worth mentioning from any ally, and the passionate opposition of France and the entire uncommitted world. But that is not all.

Certain Republicans disgracefully exploited Truman's war for political gain. But all responsible opinion recognized that President Truman had no real choice but to oppose the overt aggression in Korea. President Johnson has no real choice but to oppose the covert aggression in Vietnam. But partly because the aggression is covert the Vietnamese war is widely unpopular and very little understood.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 54 percent of the voters want to "stop military action," or "withdraw completely," or "stop fighting, start negotiations." If Korean-scale casualties now ensue—33,000 American dead, as against a few hundred so far in the Vietnamese war—the war could become the most divisive in a hundred years.

Partly this is because a lot of people—not only the intellectuals—feel an obscure sense of guilt about the Vietnamese war. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER recently cited one reason why: "What do the South Vietnamese people want to do? Stay Independent? Join the North? Keep the Americans there? Unless we ask the South Vietnamese what they want to do, our presence there looks like an occupation."

The Communists are highly unlikely to accept a cease-fire or the other obvious preconditions necessary to "ask the South Vietnamese people what they want to do." But the gesture of offering to ask them ought to be made, if only to erase that sense of guilt.

Above all, the present policy on informing the American people about the Vietnamese war ought to be radically changed. Under that policy, a State Department public-relations underling lets slip the fact that American ground troops are to start fighting in Asia, as though that were a matter of no importance. If a Korean-scale war is really in prospect, then a time of very great trouble surely lies ahead, and a combination of obsessive secrecy and rosy pressagentry is no way to prepare the country for that time.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 11, 1965]

**A YEAR OF ESCALATION FOR TAYLOR—VIETCONG, HOWEVER, STEPPED UP ITS TEMPO A BIT FASTER THAN WE DID**

(By John Maffre)

SAIGON.—Just a year ago last Wednesday, Maxwell D. Taylor stepped from a presidential jet at the airport here, a proconsul with authority rare in American diplomatic history.

President Johnson had taken the almost unprecedented step of assigning a senior career diplomat, U. Alexis Johnson, as Taylor's deputy, and Johnson was waiting as Taylor stepped from the plane wearing a white suit, a radical switch from his four-star uniform as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Also at the airport was then Lt. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, head of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, who would be getting his fourth star as a full general within 3 weeks.

Taylor read a brief statement including the protocol sentence, "I have the greatest respect for General Khanh and his colleagues in the government who carry the responsibilities of leaders." Then he drove in a black Lincoln limousine to the cramped Embassy near the waterfront to begin work.

A week earlier, Henry Cabot Lodge had vacated that Embassy. Last Thursday, a year and a day after Taylor's arrival, it was announced that the general was quitting the place—in favor of Henry Cabot Lodge.

Taylor inherited an unusually large Embassy staff when he took possession a year ago, a staff whose interneal quarrels over the fall of President Ngo Dinh Diem were not yet completely stilled. He also took over a U.S. Operations (AID) Mission and a U.S. Information Service staff totaling nearly 1,000 civilians, and a force of more than 16,000 servicemen who were advising South Vietnam's warriors in their fight against the Vietcong.

The day Taylor arrived, the Pentagon revealed that 146 Americans had died in action in South Vietnam since January 1, 1961. The day before, almost prophetically, the first Australian military adviser had died when the Vietcong attacked a remote Special Forces camp in the highlands named Nam-dong.

**A FRANTIC TWELVEMONTH**

In the year since then, the military, political, and economic picture has changed drastically. Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh lives in polite banishment in New York, a bewildering series of civilian successors and unformed aspirants has come and gone and today another military junta is in power.

Some 300 more Americans have died as the pace of war has increased. There are now nearly 60,000 American troops in South Vietnam, including 9 combat battalions that have gone on the offensive, and at least 6 more battalions are on the way.

U.S. 7th Fleet aircraft have pounded North Vietnam for 5 months as well as launching incountry strikes against the Vietcong, sweeping South China Sea avenues of infiltration and sending cruisers and destroyers to bombard shore positions.

The U.S. Air Force, using almost its full range of Century jet strike aircraft, has hammered the enemy in both the north and the south and at least 15 Army helicopter companies are providing rapid air mobility which partly offsets the Vietnamese troop shortage, frequently carrying recently introduced U.S. Marine Corps and airborne combat units.

Other American units have pitched in to help an Australian infantry battalion that was getting its first taste of combat; the Philippines have provided a surgical team; South Korean engineers are supporting the South Vietnamese; a New Zealand artillery battery is expected, and soon there may be the largest "third country" contribution of all: a complete South Korean combat division.

**ENEMY BOLSTERED, TOO**

In brief, what was once a counterinsurgency effort is moving toward full-scale war. Unfortunately, however, this war is still going in favor of the Vietcong.

Massively reinforced by North Vietnamese cadres and equipped with a new family of Communist-bloc weapons, largely from Red

July 12, 1965

Chinese, the Vietcong's regular and paramilitary strength is now well in excess of 100,000. They dominate a far larger share of the South Vietnamese countryside than they did a year ago, particularly in the highlands, and they have regularly overwhelmed government forces in regiment-size attacks, sometimes even using motorized transport.

There have been some pluses on the American side. For one thing, the United States has backed a positive policy of full commitment to aid South Vietnam in preserving independence, notably by striking north and serving notice that there is no longer such a thing as an inviolate sanctuary.

Other U.S. pluses are less striking. The official thinking of the American mission here is that despite the merry-go-round of governments, at least none has been unfriendly to the United States.

Militarily, the United States has provided the logistics for an increase of 100,000 in the government's paramilitary forces and has helped double the once feeble national police to at least 42,000. Economically, in addition to herculean efforts to expand and diversify the productive base, the United States so far has been able to stave off the threat of runaway inflation.

#### NO HINT OF TALKS

The minuses are ominous. There is still no strong, stable government demonstrably responsible to the people. The downward military trend since early May persists and despite an increase in recruiting, the strength of the Vietcong relative to that of the government grows steadily larger.

Most important, efforts here and elsewhere have not convinced Hanoi—or Peking—that it would be best for its leaders to send a delegation to a conference table.

It was sometime last autumn that the conclusion was reached that South Vietnam by itself could not generate sufficient energy to get the war effort off dead center. Attacks on the 7th Fleet in August had demonstrated that the "Democratic Republic of Vietnam"—Hanoi—was prepared to act in a big way.

Within a few months, a startling increase in infiltration from the North had forced South Vietnam and the United States to a more realistic appraisal of the odds against them. This increase in the odds was confirmed in February by the discovery of an enormous cache of Chinese Communist weapons which has been ferried into Vungro harbor on the central Vietnamese coast.

The relatively modest plans for an increase in American support were revised upward. Other plans were made to help the Vietnamese boost their total of men under arms—now fewer than 600,000—by 160,000. The serious American military assessment, however, is that this level will not be approached before the middle of 1966 and that it may be 1967 before it is realized.

In the interim, it was concluded that a large infusion of U.S. combat units was vitally necessary. Marine and Army troops have poured into such strategic areas as Danang and Chu Lai, a harbor is being prepared farther south at Cam Ranh Bay and airfields are being guarded at Bien Hoa and Vungtao, closer to Saigon.

In the opinion of one senior officer, the Vietcong strategy aimed at full victory in 1965 has been blunted but has not lost its thrust. Their success is becoming more and more evident in this capital.

Power blackouts caused by sabotage are becoming more frequent. Prices of foodstuffs from the Mekong Delta in the south and the highlands around Dalat are rising because of shortages. The increasing threat of terrorism was evidenced last week by the evacuation of the largest American officers' billet—in the Rex Hotel—because of a bomb scare.

As far as the American mission is concerned, it has achieved greater cohesiveness

despite its proliferating numbers. The point has been made repeatedly that no recommendation was made to Washington by Taylor unless it was approved by all mission heads.

Taylor made it a practice to defer to the judgment of General Westmoreland and his staff on military matters. A source close to Taylor observed recently that in addition to his confidence in Westmoreland, whom he recommended for a second star 10 years ago and whose fourth star he pinned on last August, Taylor had enough problems on his hands without wanting to dabble in military waters again.

#### OLIN D. JOHNSTON MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am honored to advise the Senate that the friends of our late colleague, Olin D. Johnston, have initiated the establishment of an endowed professorship of political science and memorial student scholarship fund in his honor at the University of South Carolina. I can think of no more fitting tribute.

If there was anything more dear to Olin Johnston's heart than the welfare of the Federal employee, it was the education of the American people. In the truest American tradition, Olin Johnston pulled himself up by his bootstraps. Born in the cotton mill town of Honea Path, S.C., he worked in the mills from the age of 10 until he was grown. At certain times in his young life, he held down two full-time jobs and also attended school. His efforts were rewarded. He earned his bachelor's degree at Wofford College, and later a master's degree and a law degree from the University of South Carolina. Throughout his public career he helped young people in their efforts to earn a college education. There are literally hundreds of men and women today who owe their opportunity for education to Olin Johnston. They will not forget him. Through the fine efforts of his many friends, particularly Federal employees who knew and loved him, the establishment of endowed chair and a student scholarship fund at the University of South Carolina will serve as a living tribute to his life and career.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement regarding the establishment of the Olin D. Johnston Memorial Fund, and letters to Mrs. Olin D. Johnston from the President and Vice President of the United States, the Postmaster General, John A. Gronouski, and the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, John W. Macy, Jr.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COLUMBIA, S.C.—President Lyndon B. Johnson writes that memorials to the late Senator Olin D. Johnston which are being established at the University of South Carolina will be "a fitting tribute to the late Senator and a monument to his public career."

In a letter to Mrs. Johnston, the President also wrote:

"Olin Johnston's death was a great loss to the United States. He was a man with deep feeling for people and a man who worked tirelessly to help others.

"He was a great believer in the value of

education, and I am pleased to learn that a fund has been established to honor his memory.

"It is my understanding that this fund will provide for endowment of the Olin D. Johnston professorship in political science, an appropriate memorial, and for scholarships in his name at the University of South Carolina where he earned two degrees."

Mrs. Johnston has given the large and valuable collection of the late Senator's papers, representing 40 years of public service, to the University of South Carolina.

The Olin D. Johnston Memorial Fund established by the University of South Carolina Educational Foundation is receiving wide support. C. Wallace Martin, executive director of the foundation, said the fund has "the full endorsement" of national and State leaders including the Senator's former colleagues in Washington, many of whom have paid tribute to his memory on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Gifts are expected to come from throughout the United States because Senator Johnston's efforts in behalf of postal employees, Federal workers generally and other groups are well known and greatly appreciated. The individuals he helped and befriended are countless.

The postal supervisors of the Carolinas recently endorsed the Olin D. Johnston Memorial Fund as an appropriate tribute to the late Senator.

Every 1 of the 15 postal employees of Westminster in Oconee County, S.C., have contributed to the fund. Postmaster Martin D. Watkins noted in forwarding contributions to the University of South Carolina Educational Foundation. They became the first group to participate 100 percent in the support of the fund.

A permanent record of contributions will be maintained, although donors may be anonymous if the wish. Gifts to the fund are tax deductible. Checks should be made payable to the fund and sent to Olin D. Johnston Memorial Fund, University of South Carolina Educational Foundation, Columbia, S.C.

#### THE OLIN D. JOHNSTON MEMORIAL FUND

Preamble: The late Olin D. Johnston earned the eternal gratitude of the people of his native State and of postal and other Federal workers for his constant and courageous efforts in their behalf. In South Carolina he served in the legislature and was twice elected Governor. As U.S. Senator, Olin Johnston served on important committees most diligently and capably, and supported legislation worthy of merit. He walked with Presidents and other men of distinction; yet he never lost the common touch. In recognition of his life of service, friends of the Senator have established the Olin D. Johnston Memorial Fund through the University of South Carolina Educational Foundation.

Purpose: To receive funds to endow the Olin D. Johnston Professorship in Political Science and to provide for an appropriate memorial at the University of South Carolina where he earned two degrees. All funds received over and above the amount necessary for these purposes will be set aside to provide scholarships in his name for deserving students from low-income families who might otherwise be unable to continue their education.

Sources: Funds are to be solicited from friends of the late Senator Johnston in South Carolina and throughout the Nation.

Publicity: The University of South Carolina Educational Foundation will prepare publicity releases for the press, radio, and television. Cooperating organizations are asked to include information concerning the memorial fund in newsletters and other in-

July 12, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180003-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15859

Roosa (who joins him on the advisory committee) effectively deflated Reginald Maudling's scheme for reform.

Dillon and Roosa at that time thought that the need for some new form of reserves was far, far in the future. It is only to their credit that they have changed their minds.

Recently, in a commencement address in Middlebury, Vt., Dillon bluntly warned that the free world "is rapidly approaching a financial crossroads." Failure to strengthen the international monetary system, he added, could result in a "worldwide recession" \* \* \*. A strengthened international monetary system must be installed before it is needed, and not after the crash.

These are strong words. They reflect a position that many economists and academicians have taken for a long time. Even more important, Dillon's evaluation indicates that the United States will have a specific plan to put forward to its trading partners later in the year.

For all of the new clout that Dillon brings to Fowler's Treasury, however, success isn't assured. The big obstacle in the way is a stubborn man named DeGaulle.

The French attitude seems to be that there is no shortage of international liquidity—just a shortage of British reserves. The French are frankly tired of helping the British to "live above their means." Other continental powers like the Germans and Dutch are fat and content at the moment, and show no interest at all in monetary reform.

Well-informed International Monetary Fund sources think that the problem won't move off dead center until the French, the Germans, and the Dutch themselves feel a financial pinch. But everybody on this side of the Atlantic is delighted that Dillon will be at work generating and pushing ideas.

#### HIGH PRESSURE LOBBY BOYS MOVE IN FOR DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Doris Fleson, in a characteristically trenchant and persuasive column, has discussed the effect of the so-called Dirksen apportionment amendment as a godsend to State lobbyists who are fighting for special interests and against the public interest. She points out that the famed, top proved lobbying firm of Whitaker & Baxter has been retained to fight for the Dirksen amendment on a national basis. She shows how adverse the passage of the amendment could be to the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### A LIFELINE FOR STATE LOBBYISTS (By Doris Fleson)

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, ever the exponent of free enterprise, is trying to preserve the greatest over-the-counter market in America. This informal institution deals in the buying and selling of legislative favors in the 50 States.

Its brokers are the lobbyists for every variety of interest and the customers whom they shower with all manner of kind attentions, including the financial, are the State legislators. It has no rules, obeys no ethical code and its motto is: "All the traffic will bear."

Very occasionally when the more greedy overdo the act and scandal breaks out, public opinion steps in. After the cyclone passes, few legislatures enact the strong

laws needed to regulate such conflicts of interest in the future.

All these comfortable arrangements, a commonplace in State politics, are now threatened by the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote reapportionment order. It was apparent from the start, though strangely neglected in the comment, that the Court's decision would create a whole new climate for the lobbying operations which plague every capital.

This immense dividend, like one-man, one-vote, would be a casualty of the Dirksen constitutional amendment that proposes that one house of the State legislatures should be apportioned according to factors other than population. The amendment is a lifeline to the entrenched State lobbyists, an open invitation to use their great skills in a vast national effort to save their sanctuaries.

Civil rights advocates were slow to recognize that the fruits of President Johnson's historic voting rights bill could be snatched from them by the Dirksen amendment. It is true that a callous appeal has been made to Southerners on that ground, but important and well-financed lobbying has not come from the South.

Californians set up a committee early this year to make contact in all the States and assist Congress. It then hired the celebrated firm of Whitaker & Baxter, which, in 5 years of high-priced labor for the American Medical Association (1948-53), added "socialized medicine" to the language and probably staved off medicare until 1965.

The committee bears the dignified title of Citizens Committee for Balanced Legislative Representation. Adviser Whitaker has yet to evolve another masterpiece in slogans but has a "coordinator" here to help the Dirksen forces. His own cautious forecast: "I think the amendment can succeed."

The heaviest pressures come from the State legislatures themselves. They are comfortable in their troughs. They are the most out-of-date governmental machinery in the Nation and the Court's reapportionment decision was the direct result of their obdurate refusal to modernize themselves.

The executive branch, State and National, has been constantly reorganized and its techniques altered to meet new conditions. The courts, State and Federal, have undergone various forms of reorganization and reform. Congress reorganized itself in 1946 and the House leader of that effort, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, is starting a new drive to correct its demonstrated deficiencies.

But the horse and buggy approach still prevails in many State legislatures and their internal weaknesses continue to lead to stronger federalization. Many experts in State affairs openly question their capacity to handle jet and space age problems.

Their irresponsibility is largely due to minority control and this the Dirksen amendment would help to perpetuate.

*Je (Ch) Church*  
BOMB NOW, PAY LATER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for the next 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. The pressure is on in Washington to further expand the war in southeast Asia. "Bomb Hanoi," "Bomb Haiphong" the air hawks cry. Plaster North Vietnam from the skies, they say, and in the same breath criticize the sending of more American ground troops into South Vietnam, where the guerrilla war is being fought. The air hawks' prescription makes little sense,

but it is cleverly designed to feed an underlying public demand for a quick, cheap victory in Vietnam. The truth is that no such easy solution exists.

The war in the south will never be won by a bigger bombing of the north. As Dean Rusk has correctly pointed out:

The basic problem, the central problem, is in South Vietnam. No miracle in the north can suddenly transform or eliminate the problem in South Vietnam.

Accelerating the war northward through the air, however, could greatly aggravate the problem we face on the ground in South Vietnam. Indiscriminate bombing of the population centers at North Vietnam would almost certainly force Hanoi to launch some form of massive retaliation. Since we command the air, Hanoi's counterattack would have to come on the ground. The Saigon Government is up against the ropes now, desperately hanging on against the jabbing attacks of Vietcong irregulars. If the disciplined armies of Ho Chi Minh were to invade the south, Saigon's survival would hinge entirely upon an immediate and unlimited American intervention on the ground. It is not unlikely that a half million American troops would then be required to occupy and hold South Vietnam, while the remainder of Indochina would soon be overrun by Communist armies.

Even in open terrain, like that in Korea, bombing alone never stopped an army on the march. What chance would our planes have against vast numbers of trained troops advancing beneath jungle cover? Obviously, bigger bombing of North Vietnam will not extricate us from the jungle fighting in the South, but it could easily lead to an immense intensification of the ground war, and a precipitous rise in American troop casualties to the tens of thousands.

If this happens, the stage will be set for our Korean war experience to be repeated. Vietnam will soon be dubbed "Mr. Johnson's war," and, as the taste of it turns sour in the mouths of the people, there may come again a Republican candidate for President who will promise, as Eisenhower did in Korea, to bring an end to the attrition by accepting the stalemate and arranging a truce. By then, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently observed:

The United States could destroy the North Vietnamese economy from the air, but to what end? It would only make it easier for China to pick the Vietnamese plum.

So, when Representatives FORD and LAIRD, the Republican leaders in the House of Representatives, call for expanded bombing of North Vietnam, even while they position themselves to wash their hands of a spreading land war in southeast Asia, I hope that President Johnson continues to ignore them. He will be better advised to listen to the wise words of GEORGE AIKEN, the Republican dean of the Senate, who recently warned:

I, too, have been somewhat disturbed over reported statements of certain Republican leaders in recent days and weeks which might be interpreted as urging the President to broaden and intensify the war in Asia. \* \* \* I hope that my own party, the

July 12, 1965

Republican Party, will not acquire the title of "war party" \* \* \*. I hope the President will have the courage not to be needed into precipitating a great war.

I agree with GEORGE AIKEN, a man who steadfastly refuses to seek any partisan advantage from the war in Vietnam. Those who urge an expansion of aerial attacks on the north are actually inviting an expansion of the ground fighting in the south. The only country which will benefit from a widening war in southeast Asia is Communist China, not the United States, or South Vietnam.

The struggle against the Vietcong insurrection within South Vietnam itself may be long and frustrating, but it is preferable to a major American war on the Asian mainland. The clamor of the air hawks should be ignored.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted that the Senator from Idaho made the statement he has just made. I find myself in complete accord with his point of view. I should like to ask him one question for clarification. Do I correctly understand that the North Vietnamese have a well trained regular army of about 300,000, which has been committed only in very small part in the fighting in South Vietnam so far?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. There is indication that some units may have been covertly infiltrated into South Vietnam, but the great bulk of the North Vietnamese Army has not been committed to the war in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. It must be clear that if that trained North Vietnamese Army were committed to the war, they would overrun the country, unless substantial additional American divisions were promptly dispatched. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; in that event, it might well require the remainder of the standing American Army to prevent South Vietnam from being overrun.

Mr. CLARK. While we have no knowledge, of course, whether that North Vietnam army will be committed, it must be clear that the very intensive bombing of North Vietnam, including the destruction of North Vietnamese industry, could likely result in South Vietnam being destroyed from the North.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree completely. If our bombing is extended into the great population centers of North Vietnam, Hanoi will be strongly tempted to retaliate. Since Ho Chi Minh cannot retaliate by air, his only recourse will be to order his army to invade the South. When that happens, the United States will be involved in a full-scale ground war in Vietnam.

The President should be commended for the restraint he has shown in resisting the pressures from the air hawks. I applaud him for his efforts to avoid a widening war.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, when I came to the Chamber this morning, I had not expected to speak on the subject which has just been under discussion.

In the first place, no one that I know of expects a quick, cheap victory in South Vietnam. Second, no one that I know of is advocating indiscriminate bombing of civilians. In the third place, bombing alone will not eliminate the threat of war. I believe everyone agrees to that. What our action is designed to do, what President Johnson's actions are designed to do, what Representative FORD's and Representative LAIRD's actions are designed to do, is to stop the supplying of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam.

Perhaps to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] that does not make sense. He is entitled to his opinion. However, I believe it makes a great deal of sense and fits in with the President's policy.

#### INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on January 28, I cosponsored a resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) with Senators JAVITS of New York and JORDAN of Idaho requesting that the President call for an International Economic Conference.

It was felt then, as now, that such a world conference should:

First. Review the long-term adequacy of international credit.

Second. Recommend needed changes in existing financial institutions.

Third. Consider increased sharing of economic aid for development and military assistance; and

Fourth. Consider other pressing international economic problems placed before it by a preparatory committee for such conference.

We were concerned over developments which could affect the stability of the dollar, as well as the international balance-of-payments problem.

We knew that the United States had to take the initiative to strengthen international monetary and credit instruments.

I, for one, have become greatly disturbed in the ensuing months over the silence of the State Department and the Treasury Department to this call of ours for an international conference.

In fact, there have been reports that both the State Department and Treasury Department opposed such an economic conference, on the grounds that it would not be fruitful.

According to these reports, it was felt by administration spokesmen that the work should be continued through existing bodies, such as the International Monetary Fund. Also held was the feeling that such a conference now would entail a serious risk of failure, which would have a widespread adverse effect.

It was also believed in some high administration quarters that there was no general consensus of the need for such a conference.

Thus it was with a great deal of pleasure to see that over the weekend the administration has had a change of heart.

According to press reports of Sunday, July 11, the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, at President John-

son's direction, has proposed just such a conference as we called for last January 28.

But one question lingers in my mind: If the administration had been opposed to the idea following our suggestion of January 28, what has occurred to change this opposition into an insistence now that it should be held? Could it be that the administration is finally awakening to the realization that such action is and has been overdue?

Could the international monetary situation be worse than it would lead us to believe, despite the rosy statements which seem always to precede a sudden change of plans?

But whatever the reasons—and they will come out in the wash eventually—I must commend the administration for finally deciding that action is necessary to call such an international economic conference.

I ask unanimous consent that an article, entitled "United States Asks World Monetary Parley," from the Sunday Star of July 11, be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES ASKS WORLD MONETARY PARLEY (By Lee M. Cohn)

The United States proposed last night the convening of an international monetary conference to reform the world's financial system.

Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler issued the call, at President Johnson's direction, in a speech prepared for the Virginia State Bar Association in Hot Springs.

The proposed conference would rank in importance with the historic Bretton Woods meeting of 1944, which led to establishment of the International Monetary Fund and laid out the post-World War II monetary system.

As sketched by Fowler, the purpose of the conference would be creation of a system to expand international liquidity—the supply of monetary reserves and credit available to finance the growth of world commerce.

Shortages of liquidity may develop as the United States eliminates its balance-of-payments deficits. These deficits through most of the postwar period have supplied the rest of the world with a huge flow of dollars to feed the growth of reserves.

Fowler did not say when the conference might be held, but other officials indicated 1966 as the target.

"It must be preceded by careful preparation and international consultation," Fowler said, adding:

"To meet and not succeed would be worse than not meeting at all. Before any conference takes place, there should be a reasonable certainty of measurable progress through prior agreement on basic points."

But he emphasized that the United States does not want to dally, because "not to act when the time is ripe can be as unwise as to act too soon or too hastily."

He suggested establishment of a preparatory committee by the International Monetary Fund at its meeting here in September.

Fowler said he will discuss monetary reform ideas with other finance ministers in bilateral meetings here and abroad, both before and after the International Monetary Fund session.

He presumably discussed the call for a conference with Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, James Callaghan, at their meeting here late last month, and obtained his endorsement.